DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 975 JC 720 131

AUTHOR Jones, Gordon; Dennison, John D.
TITLE A Comparative Study of Persister and Non-Persister College Students.
INSTITUTION Vancouver City Coll. (British Columbia).
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 100p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Research; *Dropouts; Financial Support; Foreign Countries; *Junior Colleges; Questionnaires; *Student Attitudes; Student College Relationship; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS British Columbia

ABSTRACT

At Vancouver City College (British Columbia) research was conducted to determine any significant differences between dropouts and the total student population. Data collected from samples of persister and non-persister (withdrawing from all classes before semester completion) students consisted of three types: (1) educational, such as grade point average and enrollment status; (2) demographic; and (3) opinion, such as financial, need to work, interest in education, and radio and television habits. Sources used were a withdrawal card (non-persisters only), high school transcript, college permanent record, and closed-form questionnaire. The results of the study supported the research hypothesis that all types of students, including those of serious intellectual interests and high academic ability, withdraw from the comprehensive community college. Recommendations are: (1) community college instructors should be better trained in order to decrease student dissatisfaction; (2) since "financial problems" were given as the largest factor for attrition, an emergency fund should be established; (3) the "open door" policy should be continued; (4) the high rate of withdrawal of summer students should be examined; (5) an expanded work-study program should be provided; and (6) informal "drop-in" centers might be started where students could receive academic help. (RN)

ED 062975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PERSISTER AND NON-PERSISTER COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Gordon Jones
Vancouver City College

and

John D. Dennison
University of British Columbia

JC 720 131

Vancouver City College
Langara Campus
Vancouver, Canada
June, 1972

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 27 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Analysis	3
	Significance of the Study	7
	Delimitation	15
	Purpose and Objectives of the Study	16
	Objectives	17
	Hypotheses	19
	Assumptions	20
II	DESIGN OF STUDY	23
	Sources of Data and Sampling	23
	Non-Persister Sample	23
	Persister Sample	24
	Instrumentation	26
	Administrative Procedure	29
	Tabulation of Data	32
	Data Collection and Analysis	34
	Statistical Analysis	39
III	CONCLUSIONS	43
	Type I Data	46
	Percentage of Withdrawal Students	46

Chapter

		Page
	Age	46
	Occupation Category	47
	Economic Status	49
	Type II Data	50
	High School Grade Point Average	51
	High School Program	52
	Eligibility	53
	College Grade Point Average	54
	Semester of Enrollment	55
	Number of Courses	56
	Type III Data	57
	General Interest in Education	58
	Political Involvement in Educational Interests	59
	Decision Making Patterns	60
	Reading Habits	62
	Radio, Television and Movie Going Habits	63
	Assessment of College	64
	Influence on Educational Decision Making	67
	Reason for Withdrawal	67
	Activity after Withdrawal	68
IV	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
	Summary	70
	Institutional Recommendations	72
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		77

Page

APPENDIXES 85

A. WITHDRAWAL CARD 86

B. NON-PERSISTER QUESTIONNAIRE 88

C. PERSISTER QUESTIONNAIRE 98

D. PRELIMINARY LETTER 100

E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER 102

F. QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER SHEET 104

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Size of Non-Persister Sample, and Number in Persister Frame and Selection Interval Used to Calculate Size of Persister Sample 26

2. Number of Explanatory Letters and Questionnaires Mailed and Usable Questionnaire Responses Received, by Semester 33

3. Data Source and Data Description According to Data Type 38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The literature on students who do not persist in their studies at the tertiary or post-secondary level of education, indicates that the problem has been of constant concern to educators for decades. Although the major focus in the past has been concerned with the dropout student from secondary or high school, there has been an increasing quantity of research concerned with the dropout or withdrawing student from college, particularly the university.

The magnitude of the problem is not easy to document, especially with the growth of the two year institutions, that is, the junior college and the comprehensive community college. However, the general consensus seems to be that a substantial portion of students who enter college never persist to graduation. Iffert[1] has placed the figure at 59 per cent as the maximum percentage of entering students who eventually graduate from college. Studies at single institutions reflect a variability of withdrawal rates for different institutions. Part of this variability may be reflected in the organizational structure of the institution as well as the actual definition of the term "dropout."

---

[1] R. E. Iffert, Retention and Withdrawal of College Students, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Bulletin 1958, No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 4.

Eckland[2] has criticized a number of studies reporting attrition because they fail to determine if transfer students and re-enrolled students eventually graduate. He reported studies done at the University of Illinois on the freshman class of 1952, and at Vanderbilt University on the freshman class of 1950, where approximately one half of the students had withdrawn from college at one time or another over a ten year period, and roughly three quarters of the class had graduated within that time period. An eight year follow-up study by Irvine[3] at the University of Georgia traced the careers of students who were freshmen in 1955 and found just under one half had graduated. A Canadian study by Pigott[4] placed the graduation figure at about two thirds. In summary, it appears that a substantial portion of students who enter North American post-secondary institutions do not persist to graduation. Moreover, according to researchers such as Iffert,[5] it is apparent that the greatest number of students withdraw during their first two years of college. The previously mentioned studies normally define a "dropout" as a student who has not graduated from his particular institution. The dropout in these cases would include not only the withdrawing student, but the student who

---

[2]B. K. Eckland, "A source of Error in College Attrition Studies," Sociology of Education, XXXVIII (Fall, 1964), 60-72.

[3]D. W. Irvine, "Graduation and Withdrawal: an Eight-Year Follow-Up," College and University, XLI (Fall, 1965), 32-40.

[4]A. V. Pigott, Education and Employment, Canadian Conference on Education, Study No. 9 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1962).

[5]Iffert, p. 5.

does not re-enroll in a subsequent semester, as well as those who transferred to another institution.

Statement of the Problem

Are all types of students, including those of serious intellectual interest, high academic ability, and high socio-economic background represented in those who withdraw from a comprehensive community college prior to completing the semester of enrollment? This problem was examined through a consideration of three types of data. The three types of data were: (1) Type I data, which were based on demographic variables, (2) Type II data, which were composed essentially of educational variables, and (3) Type III data, which were based on the opinions expressed in response to a questionnaire.

Analysis

Past research on dropout students from college is suggestive of certain methodological needs for future research on the problem. Three such needs are: (1) to investigate not only the intellective variables, but also the non-intellective variables, (2) to carry out such investigations at a time when the non-persisting student, or dropout, is not likely to be defensive in his responses, and (3) to analyze such results of non-persister responses in comparison and in contrast with students who do not withdraw from study, that is, those classified as persister students.

There are four needs that will be identified as of importance in the study of non-persistence at the comprehensive community college level.

First, substantial evidence is available which shows a negative correlation between measured scholastic ability and non-persistence at college. Summerskill,[6] Eckland,[7] and Marks[8] all demonstrate such a view. Despite the fact that measured scholastic ability seems to be related to college non-persistence, such knowledge is inadequate in describing the total dropout population. Not only is the evidence based primarily on the four year college student, but such knowledge of the relationship between scholastic ability and non-persistence at college does not account for the significant number of students who are non-persisters although they apparently have satisfactory academic ability and an acceptable grade point average. While recognizing that about one third of college dropout is due to poor grades and academic failure, Summerskill[9] nevertheless noted that it is equally important to recognize that the majority of students leave college for non-intellective reasons. A further position could be taken that even among college dropouts ascribed to intellectual failure, there are undoubtedly many cases where the underlying problems are other than lack of ability. Such was the approach taken by Farnsworth.[10]

---

[6]J. Summerskill, "Dropouts From College," The American College, ed. N. Sanford (New York: John Wiley Co., 1962), pp. 627-57.

[7]Eckland, pp. 60-72.

[8]E. Marks, "Student Perceptions of College Persistence and their Intellective, Personality and Performance Correlates," Journal of Educational Psychology, LVIII (August, 1967), 201-21.

[9]Summerskill, p. 654.

[10]D. S. Farnsworth, "Some Non-Academic Causes of Success and Failure in College Students," College Admissions, II (1955), 72-8.

It was noted from the studies completed on relationship of scholastic ability to persistence that non-intellective as well as intellective variables may contribute to college attrition.

This study will record and analyze such intellective variables as: (1) grade point average, and (2) enrollment status, as well as non-intellective variables such as: (1) financial need to work, (2) opinion toward the specific college, and (3) radio and television viewing habits.

A second need arises from the fact that many of the present studies include any student who does not complete his certificate, diploma or degree requirement, as well as those students who transfer to other institutions. As Iffert[11] has indicated, about three quarters of the transfer students eventually graduate. Although this figure appears somewhat higher than in the present British Columbia situation, a study done by Dennison and Jones[12] indicated that 47 per cent of transfer students did graduate within two years of transfer. For this reason the "dropout" is defined somewhat differently from other studies surveyed and includes only the student who does not persist through the complete semester of enrollment. This approach will present a more valid view of the non-persister. In addition, some consideration was given to the return to study of the non-persister and the subsequent record of persistence and academic achievement.

---

[11] Iffert, p. 4.

[12] John D. Dennison and Gordon Jones, A Long Range Study of the Subsequent Performance and Degree Attainment of Students Who Transferred

A third need was to examine prior college environment of individuals who were non-persisters. The dichotomy that classifies all non-persister students in one group and all persister students in another group fails to explore not only important differences between the two groups but within the groups of non-persister students and persister students.

The failure to make a distinction among students in reference to previous college environment may be crucial and produce results less precise than desired. This study has compared students classified not only on the basis of persistence and non-persistence, but also with reference to various views regarding their college and pre-college life.

A fourth need was to recognize that the reasons for withdrawal expressed by the student at the time of withdrawal from study may not be the "true" reasons. Students, according to Knoell[13] when asked why they are withdrawing may well be more eager to terminate their relationship with the college than to give valid reasons for withdrawal. There may be a defensive attitude, if not one of outright hostility at this time, an attitude that could well preclude honest responses to various requests for information. In an attempt to overcome this disadvantage, this study has compared certain replies to questions at the time of withdrawal with answers to the same questions given one year later. In

---

from Vancouver City College to the University of British Columbia from 1966-1969 (Vancouver, B.C.: Vancouver City College, 1970), p. 24.

[13]Dorothy M. Knoell, "Institutional Research on Retention and Withdrawal," Research on College Students, ed. H. T. Sprague (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and The Center for Higher Education, 1960), pp. 41-65.

addition, reference has been made to various opinions held by the non-persister one year after his initial withdrawal from college.

In summary, four needs have been isolated as of importance in the study of persistence at a comprehensive community college. These are: (1) the relationship of intellective and non-intellective factors for both the persister and non-persister, (2) the definition of the non-persister student solely as one who has withdrawn before completion of the semester of enrollment, (3) the recognition of pre-college as well as college variables as influential in non-persistence, and (4) the investigation of certain opinions one year after attrition.

The study is designed to meet all of the aforementioned needs.

Significance of the Study

W. M. Wise some thirteen years ago wrote that

> A broad knowledge of college students is needed for fuller understanding and more effective teaching. This deeper understanding of students can be gained by exploring their backgrounds, their homes, their age, ability, sex, race, religion--all these are significant.[14]

This statement would seem to be no less important today than when first written. Throughout the years a growing number of studies have been carried out on students of the four year colleges and universities to determine general characteristics. In recent years some notable investigations of the two year junior college students have been published. Studies of a survey and experimental nature, however, have not been as frequent and detailed as they should. They tend to be "tabulative" in

---

[14] W. M. Wise, They Come for the Best of Reasons--College Students Today (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1958), p. 3.

that they define and list various data but neglect to analyze and interpret such data especially to answer the question why. This is not in itself a condemnation of these studies nor the junior colleges themselves. Yet the very nature of the junior college as a teaching institution has a tendency to preclude a research aspect. These institutions in the past decade have slowly come to realize that institutional research and development is a growing necessity.

Student demand for relevancy, society's demand accountability, and a growing awareness by faculty for the need to measure outputs, have combined to motivate various two year colleges to establish divisions of "Institutional Research and Development." Although the statement by Wise was directed at the four year college environment, his statement is no less valid for the two year institutions. Some notable studies, such as the detailed work of Knoell and Medsker,[15] have been done on the junior college student. In the last half decade, however, a new version of the junior college has gradually developed. This new model is the comprehensive community college, an institution with an express purpose of democratization of educational opportunity at the tertiary level, and of making available a minimum of two years education beyond the secondary level for all. The comprehensive community college not only has the traditional transfer function for those academically oriented students who wish to later transfer to the four year institution, but provides a

---

[15]Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer From Two- to Four-Year Colleges (Berkeley: Center for Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1964).

general academic program as well. These two attributes do not alone distinguish the comprehensive two year institution from the junior college. But in addition the comprehensive community college provides an opportunity for students desirous of a career training program by including technical and vocational facilities. Secretaries, laboratory technicians, upholsterers, news reporters, chefs, hotel managers, are some of the career programs to be found in the comprehensive college's curricula.

It would seem, at least at first glance, that the colleges were becoming more relevant and accountable to society. Yet at the same time, one of the problems found in other institutions of tertiary education has become evident in the comprehensive community college, that of student non-persistence. The two year college non-persister, sometimes classified as a dropout, has been of concern to educators for a number of years, but surprisingly enough, the study of attrition is vague and meager. Yet, here is an area of study equally important as studies of the transfer program.

Interest in attrition factors and the study of these factors from a causative point of view should stem from at least two origins.

First, there is a view that the rapid growth of the comprehensive college with its marked increase in complexity and size, and its attempt to be all things to all persons, has contributed to a high attrition rate at a time when efficiency of operation should be the key word. For both the non-persister and the comprehensive college itself, attrition is a waste of money, time and energy.

Financially, both college and the student lose. Depending upon the time of official withdrawal, the student may forfeit from 20 per cent to 100 per cent of his tuition. Depending on enrollment status, that is the number of courses taken, this loss may range from ten dollars to over 100 dollars in tuition alone. This is a sum of money that few students can reasonably afford to lose. The college on the other hand depends, at least in part, on tuition for operating expenses: it suffers financially when students leave. This is both a long and short term problem. No matter what the nature and size of other sources of income, tuition does help pay faculty salaries and operational costs. Student attrition not only cuts into the existing budget but may lower future budgets through lower enrollment. Educational institutions should not continue to look upon the student as an unlimited resource, a resource that will ensure high enrollment and hence a continuing source of revenue. Depending on the reason for attrition, the non-persister may or may not be a future client for the comprehensive college.

The time and energy factors for both college and student are factors in efficient institutional operation. The college faculty and staff have expended considerable time and energy in pre-enrollment counselling, registration, instructional activity and processing of the student up to the time of withdrawal. The student likewise has had his energies and time devoted to these activities which may at the time of dropout seem a complete loss. Just what a quantitative analysis of this time and energy would demonstrate remains to be seen.

Secondly, a growing concept that the underlying function of the comprehensive community college is, or should be, a training center rather than an educational center, has enabled a more heterogeneous clientele to become involved in college activities. This democratization of education beyond secondary school is evident in the suppositions that the college should qualify the young and not so young for entrance into a variety of careers in business, industry, science, technology, home making and community service. These are looked upon by parents and students, business and government, as institutional objectives which have the support of many. When students become non-persisters, they often attribute the blame for their failure to the college. Although in certain areas the blame may be justified, in the majority of cases it seems ill-directed. In either case, educators become sensitive to the local attrition rate and statistical counts of dropout students are recorded. These counts, although they may be justified, do little to ameliorate the condition and the problem is then likely to recur unless a more positive analysis is instituted and the basic questions as to circumstances and reasons why such attrition occurs are tackled.

The Canadian educational environment, and especially the British Columbia scene, is particularly suitable for a study on non-persister students. Nine comprehensive community colleges have been established in British Columbia since 1965. Although junior colleges have been established in the United States for a number of years, such institutions are new to tertiary education not only in British Columbia but in other parts of Canada. There may be considerable diversity of opinion as to

what kind of colleges best meet the purposes intended, but despite these differences the fundamental goals would seem to be similar: (1) to raise the general educational level of the population, (2) to meet the rapidly expanding and changing job skill and training requirement of society, (3) to provide a bridge between secondary education and university, and (4) to try to relieve the financial and enrollment pressure on universities. The attainment of these goals will most certainly be influenced by the students attending the college as well as the students who do not persist in their studies, in other words those who drop out of study before the completion of their own goal. It is, therefore, important at the early stage of comprehensive community college development to study the character of the non-persister, the student who enrolls for a course of study but does not complete the semester of enrollment.

More than a profile of the non-persister is needed. An analysis of the intellective, demographic and opinion variables evident in such students may indicate just why this attrition occurs and what conditions could be met to stem the problem before it occurs and thereby reduce the rate of attrition.

If Canada is to play the role she ought in twentieth century affairs, her educational system must be nourished and expanded at an unprecedented rate. The task in British Columbia will be one of paramount importance, where as estimated 25 per cent of the college age population will seek entry into college or university in the province in 1972.[16] This proportion will compare to about 21 per cent for

[16] The Royal Commission on Education (Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1961), p. 30.

the nation as a whole.

It is doubtful if one could measure what percentage of a population has the intellectual endowment to profit by education beyond secondary school, but if it were possible to select the ablest and best qualified 25 per cent of all students in 1972, the outlook would be very encouraging. However, striking evidence of the inadequacy of the current selection practices in Canada is the fact that of every 100 pupils entering grade eleven, only nine ultimately enter university and only six of these graduate.[17] If the democratization of tertiary education is to become a reality rather than just a goal, more persons must be attracted to the post secondary field and once there be given a greater opportunity to succeed. Success may come in a number of ways, but certainly will not be achieved to the fullest extent until the attrition rate is reduced.

If the cause of attrition stemmed from a lack of ability on the part of the student, a reversal of the "open door" admission policy might be in order. But there is every reason to believe that the causes of attrition may be as varied as the socio-economic-cultural background of community college students. The broad socio-economic base from which the British Columbia community college student evolves was clearly identified in a study by Dennison and Jones.[18] As Fletcher has stated:

---

[17]Pigott, p. 2.

[18]John D. Dennison and Gordon Jones, A Socio-Economic Study of College Students (Vancouver, B.C.: Academic Board for Higher Education in B.C., 1971).

> But even when everything has been done to equalize opportunity in secondary education many studies make it clear that a child's home background and environment play as large or even a larger part in educational growth than innate ability.[19]

If Fletcher's statement is a valid one, one might expect to find persons from certain backgrounds to perform less well at college than persons from other backgrounds, which in turn would lead to the conclusion that the background of a college student would be influential in determining whether the student would persist in his studies or become a dropout.

In summary, the significance of the study can be expressed with a consideration of two main points: (1) the need for efficiency of operation of the community college, and (2) the need for a more heterogeneous clientele to remain enrolled in college study. Medsker and Tillery have also pointed out the importance of the study of student persistence. They state:

> It is appropriate that concern about the lack of persistence among community college students be expressed. The record would suggest that the colleges themselves are failing to offer programs and services of a nature and in a manner that hold students. This problem should be one of the greatest priorities for research and deliberation on the part of those individuals in state agencies responsible for the planning of community colleges. On the other hand, it is totally inappropriate to view all student attrition as a "dropout" problem.[20]

---

[19]Basil Fletcher, Universities in the Modern World (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1968), p. 37.

[20]Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery, Breaking the Access Barriers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971), pp. 49-50.

Delimitation

The study is an investigation and analysis of certain educational, demographic, and opinion data for non-persister students and persister students from the Langara Campus of Vancouver City College, Vancouver, British Columbia. These data were classified as Type I data, Type II data, and Type III data. The college is a comprehensive two year community college operating from four campuses in the City of Vancouver. The Langara Campus is a truly comprehensive campus of the college complex in that it is the only campus offering all aspects of the comprehensive curricula, that is, career, academic terminal, academic transfer, and community involvement courses. This college complex, governed by an appointed college council, is not only the largest from the enrollment point of view within the province, but has been in operation the longest, a period of six years.

The universe for the study comprised the students who were enrolled at the Langara Campus during one of the three semesters comprising the 1969-70 academic year. The three semesters were (1) the fall semester, September to December, 1969, (2) the spring semester, January to April, 1970, and (3) the summer semester, May to August, 1970.

The study is of those on-campus college students who withdrew from all their classes before the completion of the semester of enrollment. Students who, while enrolled at Langara Campus, but attended the college at locations other than this campus, that is, officially part of the Langara enrollment but have their classes in various high schools throughout the city in the evening and Saturday morning are not included

in the study. Also, students enrolled in the college preparatory program, that is, those classes that prepare the student for College entrance, were excluded from the universe.

There were three main sources of information: (1) a withdrawal card completed at the time of withdrawal from all courses by the student through the Student Service office, (2) official records of the college student on file in the Student Services Division of Langara Campus, and (3) responses to a mailed questionnaire.

In summary, the scope of the study is such as to include: (1) college level students, (2) enrolled in classes held at Langara Campus, (3) on both a part time or full time basis, (4) who withdrew completely from all classes before the completion of the semester of enrollment, (5) during the academic year starting September 1969, and ending in August, 1970. The study does not include: (1) those students on the college preparatory program, (2) those college students studying at off-campus locations, or (3) those who had only withdrawn from some but not all of the courses in which enrolled.

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted to obtain a description of various (1) educational data, (2) demographic data, and (3) opinion data of non-persister comprehensive community college students and to provide certain information regarding the non-persister based on a one-year follow-up questionnaire. The research hypothesis to be examined may be stated as follows: all types of college level students, including those of serious

intellectual interest and high academic ability withdraw from a comprehensive community college prior to the completion of the semester of enrollment.

Objectives

The major objectives to be accomplished in the study are: (1) to identify the non-persister and persister sample for each of the three semesters comprising the academic year 1969-70, (2) to describe certain educational characteristics of the non-persister and persister samples from college records, (3) to examine certain demographic characteristics of the non-persister and persister sample, (4) to record from the withdrawal card the stated reason for attrition as given at the time of drop-out, (5) to determine certain demographic characteristics and opinions of the non-persister and persister samples one year after the specific semester of enrollment, and (6) to determine if there are any significant differences as demonstrated through use of the chi-square test between the non-persister sample and the persister sample in relationship to various educational, demographic and opinion data.

Within the foregoing prime object was certain specific objectives to be encouraged. In the identification of certain educational characteristics of the non-persister and persister sample subjects, the following specific objectives were sought:

1) The determination of the high school program taken prior to entry into college.
2) The determination of the high school grade point for the two years prior to transfer to college.

3) The determination if pre-college achievement was sufficient to have allowed members of the non-persister and persister samples to have enrolled directly in a university.
4) The determination of the number of semesters of enrollment at college prior to the semester of attrition.
5) The determination of enrollment status, that is full time or part time, of the non-persister at the time of attrition.
6) The determination of the college grade point averages for the non-persister and persister samples for the semester prior to the semester under study.
7) The determination of the cumulative college grade point averages for all the semesters of enrollment prior to the semester under study for the non-persister sample and the persister sample.

In the identification of certain demographic characteristics, the following objectives were sought:

1) The determination of the age and sex grouping of the non-persister and persister samples.
2) The determination of the occupational category for the grandfather of the non-persister and persister sample subjects.
3) The determination of the occupational category for the father of the non-persister and persister sample subjects.
4) The determination of the occupational category for subjects of the non-persister and persister samples.
5) The determination of the relative economic position of the non-persister and persister sample subjects during their childhood.

The following objectives were sought from an analysis of the questionnaire responses from both the non-persister and persister samples:

1) The determination of the general interest in education during the pre-college years.
2) The determination of the influence of others on the decision making of non-persister and persister sample subjects.
3) The determination of the type of reading material read regularly by members of both samples.
4) The determination of the amount of time spent listening to the radio, watching television and going to the movie theater for both samples.
5) The determination if the individual sample subject, given a similar opportunity, would enroll at the college.
6) The determination of the highest academic attainment expected to be reached by the various sample subjects.
7) The determination of the source of influence upon sample subjects regarding attendance at college.

Hypotheses

The research hypothesis that all types of students withdraw from the comprehensive community college before the completion of their semester of enrollment was tested by the null hypotheses based on the foregoing specific objectives.

Assumptions

The hypotheses tested in the study are based on four basic assumptions;

1) Academic achievement in itself does not provide sufficient basis for determining why some students persist in their studies while others do not.

If the problem of attrition stemmed from academic problems, from a lack of ability, one solution might well lie in rejecting those college applicants who are assessed as being incapable of college work. This could be done by such methods as restricting college entry to those persons who have clearly demonstrated an acceptable level of competence while enrolled at secondary school. Furthermore, a battery of pre-college entrance examinations could be administered. This decision, however, would necessitate a re-thinking of the open door philosophy which is currently so much a part of the comprehensive community college movement in British Columbia. Although research on community college attrition in Canada is virtually non-existent, concern in the United States of America over a fifty year period has resulted in a number of studies involving the four year college and university. Research studies suggest that academic aptitude does not in itself account for a major portion of the withdrawals. This conclusion was arrived at in studies

done by Summerskill,[21] Sexton,[22] and Ford.[23]

2) People may differ in many important aspects. These differences in turn may be assessed in terms of educational, demographic, and opinion data.

While a primary relationship between academic aptitude and college grades is certainly acknowledged, there are non-intellectual factors such as pre-college experience which may be assumed to contribute to an understanding of the withdrawal situation in the community college.

3) If the various demographic, educational, and opinion variables are influential in persistence and non-persistence at college, there should be a significant difference in these characteristics between the persister and non-persister.

An insight into the frame of reference of the student himself must be attempted. Rather than just classify him, there must be an undertaking to understand the student.

4) The factors involved in attrition are complex and have many causes.

The listing of reasons for withdrawal into neat, mutually exclusive categories would appear to be unrealistic and of questionable value.

---

[21] Summerskill, pp. 627-57.

[22] V. S. Sexton, "Factors Contributing to Attrition in College Populations: Twenty-five Years of Research," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXII (Fall, 1965), 301-26.

[23] D. H. Ford and H. B. Urban, "College Dropouts: Successes or Failures," Educational Record, XLVI (Spring, 1965), 77-92.

Researchers such as Iffert[24] and Trent[25] have provided data to indicate that dropout is due to a complexity of causes. It might be assumed that there is a combination of causes which has a cumulative effect leading to withdrawal and that the non-persister may view his reason for withdrawal somewhat differently one year later.

In summary, the purpose of the study is to examine the research hypothesis that all types of students, including those of serious intellectual interest and high academic ability, withdraw from a comprehensive community college prior to completing the semester of enrollment. Further to this, a basic objective is to test for any significant difference in certain educational, demographic and opinion data between the non-persister sample and the persister sample. Many of the data for the testing of the hypothesis were obtained one year after the semester of initial attrition with the hope that any hostility would not be evident, and that the results would reflect a more valid appraisal of the various interests and opinions requested.

---

[24]Iffert, p. 5.

[25]J. W. Trent and Leland L. Medsker, Beyond High School (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1967), p. 152.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF STUDY

Sources of Data and Sampling

There were four main sources of data for the study. These were: (1) the withdrawal card (for the non-persister sample only), (2) the transcript of the student's high school record, (3) the official college permanent record for the individual student, and (4) the closed-form questionnaire. The closed-form questionnaire is described in the section headed "Instrumentation."

The universe from which the sample originated was described as all on-campus college students enrolled in each of the three semesters comprising the 1969-70 academic year. The enrollment for each of the three semesters was: (1) for the fall semester, 1969, 4,155 students, (2) for the spring semester, 1970, 3,982 students, and (3) for the summer semester, 1970, 1,788 students. These figures do not include those students who are defined as college preparatory students, nor do they include those college students, who although enrolled officially at Langara Campus of V.C.C., took their program of study "off-campus."

Non-persister Sample

As previously mentioned, the non-persister sample was comprised of those students who withdrew from all subjects in which enrolled and

completed, at the time of withdrawal, the withdrawal card. Over the academic year 1,213 on-campus students withdrew. This number of on-campus students who withdrew from enrollment represented 12.2 per cent of the total on-campus college level enrollment of 9,925 students. Of these, 744 (61.3 per cent) were contacted at the time of withdrawal, completed the withdrawal card, and are, therefore, defined as the non-persister sample. It should be noted that slightly over one third of the complete withdrawal group of students were not included in the sample of non-persisters. These 469 students carried out their complete withdrawal from college enrollment in stages. As this was not realized at the time of attrition, no request was made of them to complete the withdrawal card. The non-persister sample will, therefore, not include these 469 students.

Persister Sample

From the master computer print-out of all students enrolled at Langara Campus of Vancouver City College, those students who were not identified as enrolled on-campus at a college level were excluded from the study. The remainder of the students, after the non-persister students were identified, were those students who had not completely withdrawn from study at the college. These students were the persister frame. The total on-campus college level enrollment and the number of

persisters for the semesters under study is shown in these results:

Semester	Enrollment universe	Persister frame
1969-fall	4,155	3,653
1970-spring	3,982	3,618
1970-summer	1,788	1,441

The persister sample was selected from fixed intervals on the persister master list. This list was arranged in alphabetical order.

The persister sample for the fall semester, selected through the use of a systematic sampling technique, was composed of 403 students. The same methodology used for the remaining two semesters, obtained for the spring semester a persister sample numbering 226, and for the summer semester a sample of 130. The data used to calculate the size of the persister sample are given in Table 1.

The source of data for the non-persister sample was the completed withdrawal card as well as the official high school transcript and the college permanent record. For the persister sample, the high school transcript and the college permanent record were used. Since the high school transcript is a photo copy of the official Department of Education record it may be assumed that these records, where available, are accurate. In the case of the college record, courses and grades earned

were verified with the computer record which is now the official record of student achievement.

TABLE 1

SIZE OF NON-PERSISTER SAMPLE, AND NUMBER IN PERSISTER FRAME AND SELECTION INTERVAL USED TO CALCULATE SIZE OF PERSISTER SAMPLE

Semester	Non-persister sample	Persister frame	Selection interval	Persister sample
1969-fall	387	3,653	9	403
1970-spring	223	3,618	16	226
1970-summer	134	1,441	11	130

Instrumentation

Two basic instruments were used for data gathering purposes. The first of these was the withdrawal card. This card identified the non-persister by name, registration number, and his current address. The social insurance number was also requested from the student in the hope that it would make any future follow up easier. Failure to record a social insurance number by the majority of students and the inability of the governmental department concerned to trace students by the number made the social insurance number of little value.

In addition to the above mentioned identification information, space was provided for the date of withdrawal and the method of withdrawal, that is, in person, by a third party, by telephone, or by mail. The non-persister was also asked to respond to three items: (1) the

main reason for withdrawal, (2) degree of satisfaction with instructors, course offerings, and counseling, and (3) immediate plans after withdrawal.

In the determination of possible reasons for withdrawal from college and the categories for immediate plans after attrition, Student Services counselors were requested to list the most common reasons given to them by students at the time of dropout and the most common indications of post attrition activities. The most frequent replies were printed on the withdrawal card. The main reasons listed for withdrawal on the card were: (1) lack of finances, (2) prefer to work, (3) lack of interest, (4) family opposition, (5) academic difficulty, (6) health reasons, and (7) other (where space was provided for the student to indicate a reason). The most commonly reported immediate plans printed on the withdrawal card were: (1) to work, (2) re-enter V.C.C. next semester, (3) enter an educational institute other than V.C.C., (4) travel, and (5) undecided.

Other information requested on this card was a "yes" or "no" indication of satisfaction with faculty, course offerings and counseling. As has previously been mentioned, this card was given to all students reporting to the Student Services Division indicating that they were withdrawing from all courses of enrollment (Appendix A).

The second data gathering instrument was the closed-form questionnaire. Two forms of the questionnaire were prepared, one for the non-persister (Appendix B) and one for the persister (Appendix C). The only difference between the two was a slight rewording of questions 41,

42 and 43. This rewording was necessary, since for the non-persister sample the questions asked for responses to their withdrawal situation, while for the persister sample the questions asked for response to a potential withdrawal situation. The various questions throughout the questionnaire were designed to obtain opinions on certain matters from both the non-persister sample and the persister sample. The basic opinion areas surveyed and the relevant questions are listed below.

1) Pre-college educational interest, questions 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9.
2) Educational interest during college years, questions 3, 4, 7, and 8.
3) Political involvement in areas of educational interest, questions 11, 12, and 13.
4) Family decision making, questions 14, 15, and 16.
5) Use of magazine and newspapers, questions 20 and 21.
6) Time spent in listening to the radio, watching television and going to the movies, questions 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.
7) Assessment of college environment, questions 34, 35, 36, 37, and 44.
8) The influence of others on educational decision making, questions 17, 39, and 40.
9) Reason for college attrition (non-persister sample) or probable reason for possible future attrition (persister sample), question 41.
10) Major activity after attrition (non-persister sample) or probable major activity after attrition if dropout should occur in the future (persister sample), questions 42 and 43.

Administrative Procedure

The questionnaire, answer form and return stamped envelope were mailed to the non-persister and persister sample twelve months after the conclusion of the specific semester under consideration. The procedure was as follows. From three to four weeks prior to the mailing of the questionnaire, an explanatory letter, personally signed, was mailed to each sample member. A copy of this letter is in Appendix D. This letter explained about the questionnaire and requested the cooperation of the recipients in responding. There were three initial mailings of this letter; February 1, 1971, to the persister sample and non-persister sample from the fall, 1969, semester; May 3, 1971, to those sample members from the spring, 1970, semester; and on July 19, 1971, for the sample members from the summer, 1970, semester.

A certain number of the initial mailings were returned by the Post Office as undeliverable. Among the reasons given were: no such address, not known at this address, and moved. In the case of mail returned for the first two reasons, the college record for both persister sample and non-persister sample was checked for a second or different address. If one was found, the explanatory letter was then directed to this alternative address. In the case of letters returned because the student had moved, one telephone call was made in the early evening of a week day to the residents of the student's last known address in hope that a forwarding address was available. If such an address was available, a copy of the explanatory letter was sent to the new address. At the end of a three week period from the initial mailing of the explanatory letter,

all names of students from the sample whose letters were returned by the Post Office and where further contact was not made were noted on the master computer printout and these sample members were not sent the questionnaire.

The questionnaire, answer form, and stamped return envelope were then mailed to all sample members who could be contacted by mail, that is, all those for whom the explanatory letter had not been returned by the Post Office. The answer form was stamped with a six digit identification number and the corresponding number recorded opposite the student's name on the master list. The initial mailing of the questionnaire was done on March 1, 1971, for the non-persister sample and the persister sample from the fall, 1969, semester; May 26, 1971, for the spring, 1970, semester sample; and August 9, 1971, for the summer, 1970, semester sample members.

For those persons whose answer form had not been returned within two weeks, a second mailing of the questionnaire with an accompanying letter (Appendix E), answer blank, and return stamped envelope was carried out. In case the subject was hesitant about being identified by the code number, this number was stamped on the accompanying letter with the statement that the individual could either place the identification number on the answer form or leave it off. All responses to the second mailing had the identification number written in by the respondent. This procedure was once again followed for each of the three semesters concerned.

For the fall semester, there were 387 persons in the non-persister

sample. From both mailings of the initial explanatory letter a total of ninety-three letters (24.0 per cent) were returned as non-deliverable. Usable questionnaire answer forms received by the cutoff date of May 1, 1971, amounted to a total of ninety-two (23.7 per cent) for both questionnaire mailings. Of these ninety-two responses, only six were from the second mailing of the questionnaire. In the case of the persister sample composed of 406 persons, forty-seven (11.5 per cent) of the explanatory letters were returned by the Post Office. A total of 172 (42.4 per cent) usable questionnaire responses were received, the majority, 165 returns, from the first questionnaire mailing.

Returns from sample members for the spring and summer semester followed much the same pattern as for the fall semester. In the case of the 223 member non-persister sample from the spring, 1970, semester, a total of thirty-six (16.2 per cent) students could not be contacted through the mail as evidenced by the return of the explanatory letters by the Post Office. From the two mailings of the questionnaire a total return of forty-eight (21.5 per cent) responses were received prior to the July 23, 1971, cutoff date. Contact with the persister sample for the spring, 1970, semester was somewhat more successful than for the non-persister sample. In the case of the persister sample only twenty-eight (12.4 per cent) of the explanatory letters mailed to the 226 member sample were returned by the Post Office, while eighty-one (35.8 per cent) usable responses were received from the first and second mailing of the questionnaire.

From the two mailings of the explanatory letter to the

non-persister sample from the summer, 1970, semester, the Post Office returned a total of forty-five (33.6 per cent) as undeliverable. Return of usable questionnaire responses amounted to twenty-nine (21.6 per cent). For the persister sample the return of the explanatory letter by the Post Office numbered twenty-six (19.8 per cent) while a total of forty-five (34.4 per cent) returned usable questionnaire responses.

The usable responses over the three semester period of the study for the non-persister sample totaled 169 (21.9 per cent) and for the persister sample 298 (39.1 per cent). This overall return for the three semesters was low, especially in the case of the non-persister sample. The foregoing information may be found in Table 2.

Tabulation of data

All but eight of the forty-four questions in the questionnaire had answer responses that were pre-coded. In several questions, however, an evaluation was required of the respondent's answer. In questions 27, 29, 31, and 33 the respondent was requested to indicate: (1) kind of business, and (2) kind of work, for his father, grandfather, himself, and the head of the household. From this information a determination of the actual occupational category was made. The occupational categories, similar to those used in the Canadian Census of 1971, were: managerial, professional, technical, clerical, sales, service, recreational, transportation, communication, primary, craftsmen, production process, laborer, and farmer. Computer programing code numbers were assigned to each of these categories.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF EXPLANATORY LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED AND USABLE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES RECEIVED, BY SEMESTER

	Semester							
	Fall, 1969		Spring, 1970		Summer, 1970		Total	
	P[a]	P̄[b]	P	P̄	P	P̄	P	P̄
Sample								
N	406	387	226	223	131	134	763	774
Explanatory letter								
Individuals to whom mailed	406	387	226	223	131	134	763	774
P.O. return, first mailing	23	79	23	32	19	36	65	147
P.O. return, second mailing	24	14	5	4	7	9	36	27
P.O. total return	47	93	28	36	26	45	101	174
Total not returned by P.O.	359	294	198	187	105	89	662	570
Questionnaire								
Initial mailing	359	294	198	187	105	89	662	570
Second mailing	194	208	121	141	62	64	377	413
Usable responses received								
Initial mailing	165	86	77	46	43	25	285	157
Second mailing	7	6	4	2	2	4	13	12
Total	172	92	81	48	45	29	298	169
Total percentage	42.4	23.7	35.8	21.5	34.4	21.7	39.1	21.9

[a]Persister

[b]Non-persister

Computer code numbers were also required for the responses to questions 22, 23; 24, and 25 dealing with the time spent listening to the radio and viewing television. The time categories set for responses to these questions were: under one-half an hour, from one-half an hour to one hour, between one hour and one and one-half an hour, up to two hours, and then at one hour intervals up to and including the category of seven or more hours.

The response form was also coded for the sex of the respondent, semester identification, and whether a member of the non-persister sample or the persister sample. A computer program to tabulate the responses by question, sex, semester, and non-persister or persister category was developed by a computer technician of the Vancouver City College computer center. The computer tabulated data obtained in the above process were then tested statistically.

Data Collection and Analysis

There were four data sources. Two of these were documentary, that is, pre-college records, and official college records. A third source was the short withdrawal card, and the one year follow-up questionnaire was the fourth source of data.

For the purpose of the study, the data, regardless of source, were categorized as Type I, Type II, and Type III data.

Type I data were basically demographic and were obtained for both the non-persister sample and the persister sample from the college records and the responses to certain questionnaire items. Age and sex was recorded from the college records for all sample members. From

responses to the questionnaire, data were obtained for: (1) the respondent's opinion of his family's economic background during his childhood, (2) occupational category for the respondent's grandfather, father, and head of the household, and (3) the occupational category of the student if he was presently working or had worked in the past.

The occupational divisions are similar to those found in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics' publication Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts.[1] The occupational divisions are composed of individual classes based mainly on the kind of processes performed and the kind of material worked upon regardless of the nature of business of the establishment in which it is conducted. For example, all carpenters, whether employed in construction, manufacturing or other industries are classified in the study under the "Craftsmen" division of occupations. The "Primary" occupations include loggers and related workers, fishermen and hunters, and miners. The "Laborer" category includes workers in the unskilled occupations except those in the "Primary" category. Also excluded from the "Laborer" category are longshoremen and other freight handlers who would be included under "Production Process."

Type II data for the non-persister were secured from three sources, the pre-college records of the student (high school records primarily), the official student college record, and the withdrawal

---

[1]Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Bulletin CT-22, Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tract (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963), p. 29.

card completed by the non-persister sample members. In the case of Type II data for the persister sample, only the pre-college transcripts and official college records were used.

The Type II data are essentially data on educational matters or educationally related matters. In the case of both the non-persister and persister sample members these data consisted of: (1) grade XI and grade XII high school grade point average and percentage, (2) type of high school program taken, that is, academic, technical, or academic-technical, and (3) eligibility for entrance to The University of British Columbia at the time of first enrolling at V.C.C. The data were obtained from the pre-college records.

The following Type II data for both non-persister and persister sample members were obtained from the college records: (1) cumulative grade point average (G.P.A.) for all semesters of college level enrollment, to include only college level courses, prior to, but not including, the semester under study, (2) G.P.A. of college level courses for the semester immediately prior to the semester under study, (3) enrollment status, that is full time or part time, at the commencement of the semester under study, and (4) the total number of semesters enrolled in college level courses. In addition to the above, the following information was obtained from the college records for members of the non-persister sample only: (1) whether the non-persister had re-enrolled at the college in any of the three semesters immediately following withdrawal, (2) if such re-enrollment occurred, the number of semesters, and (3) the G.P.A. for any of such semesters.

Further Type II data were obtained from the withdrawal card for members of the non-persister sample. These data consisted of: (1) the reason for withdrawal from the college, (2) the immediate plans of the dropout, (3) assessment of college instructors, courses, and counseling, and (4) the date of withdrawal.

Type III data were essentially opinions of the students obtained from responses to the questionnaire which was mailed to the sample members one year after the completion of the semester under study. The non-persister was asked for: (1) the reason for withdrawal, (2) the activity engaged in during the first thirty days after withdrawal, (3) the activity engaged in during the first twelve month period after withdrawal, and (4) the assessment of the college. The persister sample were asked to: (1) indicate a probable reason for withdrawal, if he should ever decide to leave the college, (2) indicate what he would probably do during the first thirty days after withdrawal, (3) indicate what he would probably do during the twelve month period after withdrawal, and (4) indicate assessment of the college.

In addition to the foregoing, both the non-persister and persister sample were asked for their opinions on: (1) educational interests and goals, (2) influence of others on their decision making process, and (3) type of reading material read as well as time spent listening to the radio, viewing television and screening movies.

The various categories of Type I, Type II, and Type III data are outlined in Table 3 .

TABLE 3

DATA SOURCE AND DATA DESCRIPTION ACCORDING TO DATA TYPE

Data Type	Data Source	Data description	Sample
Type I	College record	Age Sex	NP[a] and P[b]
	Questionnaire	Family economic background Occupational category	NP and P
Type II	Pre-college record	Gr. XI and XII G.P.A. Type of high school program enrolled Eligibility for entrance to U.B.C.	NP and P
	College record	College cumulative G.P.A. G.P.A. for semester prior to study Enrollment status (full or part time)	NP and P
		Re-enrollment subsequent to withdrawal No. semesters of re-enrollment G.P.A. for semesters of re-enrollment	NP only " "
	Withdrawal card	Reason for withdrawal Immediate plans Assessment of college	NP only " "
Type III	Questionnaire	Reason for withdrawal Immediate thirty day activity Activity for 1 year period	NP only " "
		Probable reason for withdrawal Probable 30 day activity after WD Probable 1 year activity after WD Assessment of college	P only " " "
		Educational interests and goals Influence of others on decisions Type of reading material Time spent listening to radio, T.V.	NP and P " " "

[a]Non-persister sample

[b]Persister sample

Statistical Analysis

Type I, Type II, and Type III data were statistically analyzed in an effort to control variability due to experimental error. Three tests were used: (1) the chi-square test for two independent samples,[2] (2) the simultaneous large-sample multiple comparison method[3] to test for the source of significant variation, and (3) the McNemar test for the significance of changes.[4]

Although there is considerable merit in using two related samples in a research design, to do so in this particular study was impractical. In fact, the very nature of the research design was such as to make the use of two related samples inappropriate. In this case, then, the two samples were each drawn at random from two populations, that is, the persister population and the non-persister population. To further complicate the matter, the populations used were from three frames, that is, three separate semesters. Since total enrollment figures for these three semesters differed and since the numbers comprising the persister population and non-persister population differed, this particular application of the chi-square test was used since it is not necessary that the two samples be of the same size.

The chi-square test for two independent samples was particularly useful in testing for the "significance of the difference" between the

---

[2]Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956), pp. 104-7.

[3]Leonard A. Marascuilo, "Large-Sample Multiple Comparisons," Psychological Bulletin, LXV (May, 1966), 283-84.

[4]Siegel, pp. 63-7.

two independent samples. In other words, the objective was to determine whether the two samples were from populations which differed in any respect. The null hypothesis of "no significant difference" at the .01 level of significance was tested on the following data: (1) age, (2) high school grade point average, (3) cumulative college grade point average, (4) grade point average for the college semester prior to the semester under consideration, (5) number of semesters of college enrollment prior to the semester under consideration, (6) number of subjects enrolled, (7) eligibility for enrollment in university directly from high school, and (8) high school program previously enrolled in. The null hypothesis of "no significant difference" was also tested on the responses to the questionnaire from the persister and non-persister sample.

As may be seen, the hypothesis under test is that two groups differ with respect to certain characteristics and therefore with respect to the relative frequency with which group members fall in several categories.

The null hypothesis was tested by

$$x^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

In this formula O_{ij} equals the observed number of cases categorized in ith row of jth column and E_{ij} equals the number of cases expected under the null hypothesis to be categorized in the ith row of jth column.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k}$$

directs that one sum over all (r) rows and all (k) columns. The values of x^2 yielded by the above formula are distributed as chi-square with df = (r -1)(k - 1), where r equals the number of rows and k equals the number of columns in the contingency table. The expected frequency for each cell, that is E_{ij}, is found by multiplying the two marginal totals common to a particular cell, and then dividing the product by the total number of cases.

If the null hypothesis were rejected, then the source of significant variation may be identified by the simultaneous large-sample multiple comparison method. A study of large-sample multiple comparisons among the parameters of K independent binomial populations, as described by Marascuilo,[5] was followed. Where the null hypothesis was rejected, a post hoc analysis of certain linear contrasts of the parameters was conducted to determine the sources of variation that were most likely responsible for the rejection of the hypothesis. The specific formula used for this aspect of the data analysis was

$$U_o' = \sum_{k=1}^{r} \hat{W}_k(\hat{p}_k - \hat{p}_o)^2$$

where

$$p_o = \sum_{k=1}^{r} \hat{W}_k\hat{p}_k \Big/ \sum_{k=1}^{r} \hat{W}_k$$

---

[5]Marascuilo, p. 283.

The third, and final, non-parametric statistical test to be used was the McNemar test for the significance of changes. This test was selected since it is particularly applicable to the "before and after" design where the individual person is used as his own control. In this case certain responses given by the non-persister questionnaire respondent were studied for any significance in change from the response given to the same items one year earlier at the time of withdrawal from college. In other words, the test used is of the before-and-after type. This test was used to test for any significant change in the non-persister (1) stated reason for withdrawal from college, (2) activity pursued after withdrawal from college, and (3) assessment of college instructors, college course offerings, and counseling services. The formula used in this case for the McNemar test was

$$x^2 = \sum_{A,D} \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

where A is equal to the observed number of cases in cell A (where cell A represents a change of responses in one direction) and D equals the observed number of cases in cell D (where cell D represents a change of response in the reverse direction to the change noted in cell A). With a correction for continuity[6] the formula used in this study was

$$x^2 = \frac{(|A - D| - 1)^2}{A + D} \qquad \text{with df} = 1.$$

[6]Siegel, p. 64.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

For some time student withdrawal from college has been regarded as, not only an educational problem, but a social as well as an economic problem. Various studies, some of which are mentioned in Chapter I have provided, not only conclusions regarding the withdrawal situation, but have added a certain amount of confusion to the topic. Poorly or undefined terminology, especially as to just what is meant by a "drop-out," has been uncovered. Various writers have indicated that at least half of those students entering college drop out prior to the completion of two years of study.

The reasons for these withdrawals are many. They drop out to attend university, to travel, to work, and they drop out, only to return at a future date, to the same college. Yet, to the layman and to a number of educators, the dropout is classed as a "problem." He is different. In fact, he is so different that society appears to have become somewhat alarmed; alarmed enough to demand that something be done. Furthermore, the predictions from some educators and writers are that the problem will be compounded in the near future.

As a larger percentage of the population enroll in the comprehensive community college, their students will demonstrate a wider range of abilities and backgrounds. More and more students from high school,

who are ineligible to enter university, will probably enter the community college. More and more adults who have interrupted their formal education will enter the community college after an interval of time. More and more "poor risk" students will enter the community college. Because of this, some feel that the attrition rate will increase. Many educators will view this problem with concern as it will be considered a measure of institutional inefficiency.

Yet over the years this so-called measure of inefficiency has remained relatively stable. Observers have indicated that the withdrawal student, or non-persister, was somehow different from his counterpart, the persister. This may have been a valid assumption, or even a conclusion, that could well apply to the four year college, the university, or the junior college.

The conclusions of studies on the non-persister from a community college, generally speaking, have indicated some difference between the students who withdraw from college and the students who remain. Marks[1] has criticized previous research as "singularly lacking" in the use of adequate controls and thereby rendering the "frequently contradictory results only more uninterpretable." The only reliable conclusion, according to Marks, is that the student with a poor high school preparation has a greater chance of being a dropout. This conclusion is substantiated in the present study in addition to the fact that there

---

[1]E. Marks, "Student Perceptions of College Persistence and Their Intellective, Personality, and Performance Correlates," The Journal of Educational Psychology, LVIII (August, 1967), 211.

were no significant differences in the majority of intellectual and non-intellectual variables tested between the community college student who did not complete his semester of enrollment (the non-persister) and the community college student who did finish the semester (the persister).

The results of the study tend to support the research hypothesis that all types of students, including those of serious intellectual interest and high academic ability, withdraw from the comprehensive community college.

In the analyses and testing of the null hypotheses, several interesting factors have evolved. Various groupings of the category sources of semester, persistence, and sex, were used for the testing of the data items and questionnaire response items. These groupings included both the persister and non-persister group. In the case of the semester, and the sex category sources, a greater percentage of the null hypotheses were rejected than were rejected for the category source of persistence and non-persistence. There were, therefore, a greater number of variations in the data according to the semester in which the subject was enrolled, and according to the sex of the student than for persister and non-persister categories. These findings do indicate a certain direction of thought. The researcher who is concerned with attrition at the community college level should seriously direct his efforts to an investigation of the possible differences in the students from the several semesters in the academic year, as well as to the possible intellectual and non-intellectual variables that may influence the educational processes of the male and female student. This situation will be reported in a subsequent publication.

The facts, in the present instance, are clear. There were a greater number of statistical differences in the data items amongst the students from the three semesters under investigation, and there were a greater number of statistical differences in the data items between the male and female students, than there were in the data items between the persister and non-persister groups.

The various conclusions to the study are reported in this chapter under the three data divisions of Type I data, Type II data, and Type III data.

Type I Data

Percentage of Withdrawal Students

Twelve per cent of the enrolled students, over the academic year, were withdrawal students: a figure that was at the low end of the 12 per cent to 82 per cent figure quoted by Summerskill.[2] The male students showed a slightly greater ratio than the female, by about 2 per cent, to withdraw from college. The difference in the withdrawal rate between male and female was, however, not as significant as the difference in overall withdrawal according to semester. The rate of attrition during the summer semester was nearly twice the fall semester or spring semester rate.

Age

One misunderstanding on the part of the educational community apparently has been that the mature student, due to various characteristics,

[2] J. Summerskill, "Dropouts From College," The American College, ed. N. Sanford (New York: John Wiley Co., 1962), p. 655.

and a higher level of motivation, will be more likely to persist to graduation, after return to study, than the college age student. This was found in the study to be not so; the mature student did not demonstrate any greater tendency to persist at college study than did the younger person. In fact, the college age student, that is, those under twenty years of age, showed a persistence rate similar to the mature student, as well as a rate similar to the student in the twenty to twenty-four age category.

Occupational Category

Another broad misunderstanding about the nature of the non-persister community college student seems apparent. A belief that the non-persister comes from a "lower" economic level is not supported by the findings of the study. Categorization of occupations and specific tasks performed on the part of the grandfather and father, for the most part, demonstrated little difference, although it must be pointed out that in the "farmer" category some one quarter of the students' grandfathers were listed as compared to about 2 per cent for the fathers. This, of course, would be expected in a country that, up to World War I, was still predominantly an agricultural nation. In the remaining occupational categories (white-collar, blue-collar and laborer) little difference in reported occupations was found over the two generations. The persister student was not any more likely to be from the lower socio-economic level, as identified by occupation, than is the persister. For example, about one quarter of both the persister and the non-persister

subjects indicated their father's occupation to be from the upper socio-economic categories such as "managerial" or "professional." A further one quarter of both groups indicated occupations categorized as "laborer."

This observed trend of no statistical difference between occupational categories for persister and non-persister was also evident from the occupations of the student himself. It might be hypothesized that the non-persister would be a rather passive, apathetic individual, who consequently would not be prepared to work. Surprisingly enough, this was not the case. The percentage of non-persister students and persister students reporting occupational tasks which would be classified as "managerial," "professional," or "technical," approximated 15 per cent in each sample. About one quarter of the sample, the largest single grouping, reported they were involved in "clerical work." A somewhat lesser percentage, nearly 20 per cent, were "laborers." If the occupations of parents and students are indicators of socio-economic status, it is apparent that the community college is helping to democratize higher education. Certainly, it would be difficult to substantiate that students from the lower socio-economic categories in the community college environment are being forced into attrition solely on the criteria of socio-economic conditions.

It was of interest to note, however, that a somewhat higher percentage of the non-persister than the persister sample reported themselves as wage earners. About 40 per cent of the persisters apparently were responsible to themselves or to others as the chief "breadwinner."

Although the difference was not statistically significant, approximately 36 per cent of the persister sample indicated their responsibility in this area. As might be suspected, a slightly higher percentage of male than female students reported themselves as chief wage earner, although, as in so many of the other examples, the difference was not significant. In those cases where the student was not the wage earner (approximately 60 per cent), the proportion of white-collar and blue-collar wage earners was considerably greater than for those reporting occupations from the lower third of the occupational scale. But even here, it would be difficult to justify this as a contributing factor to the "dropout problem" since there was no significant difference in the reported occupations of either persister or non-persister questionnaire respondents.

Economic Status

When reporting an assessment of early family background from an economic point of view, the non-persister did not indicate that he came from a "poorer" family anymore so than did the persister. About 40 per cent of the non-persister subjects reported their family's economic situation, when compared by the standards of the time, to be "average" or "normal." Although less than 3 per cent classified their early family days as having been lived in "poverty," one quarter did report their conditions as "below average," with a further one quarter categorizing themselves as "better than average." Even though it might be assumed that the students from the lower economic strata would find more pressures leading to withdrawal, the difference between persister subjects and non-persister subjects in this category was not a significant one.

The fact that none of the variables concerned with occupations and economic status discriminated between the persister and non-persister subject may be of some surprise. From the literature the impression may be gained that the youth of upper class families tend to be more successful in their educational experiences. As valid as this may be from the point of view of actual achievement as represented by grades, it was not true when consideration was given to the criterion of persistence or non-persistence. There is, of course, a reasonable explanation for this apparent contradiction. In the striving for success, so often evident in the "managerial" and "professional" occupations, the parent may set goals that are unattainable either for himself or the youth. If the parental goals have become unattainable for himself, the parent may insist that his children achieve these goals instead. On the other hand, the parent may feel that the successful youth will escape from the family too soon or will highlight the parents' own failure. Parental pressures, then, may be a contributing factor to attrition, at least for those students reportedly from the upper socio-economic classification.

The basic conclusion, however, must be that in regard to the socio-economic criteria reported, that is, Type I data, there were no significant differences for any of the data items tested between the persister sample subjects and the non-persister sample subjects.

Type II Data

Type II data were essentially educational data or educationally related data, and were drawn from a study of the sample subject's high school program, high school grade point average, eligibility to enter a

university directly from high school, the length of time at college prior to withdrawal, the college course load taken, and the college grade point average.

High School Grade Point Average

The movement through the community college system may be a very different experience for the top and bottom third on the achievement scale. And this gap may well widen as the college experience continues. Some 20 per cent of the students entering the college, for whom high school grades were available, had a high school grade point average less than 2.0. Approximately 25 per cent of the male students entered the college with a high school grade point average less than 2.0, compared with less than half that percentage for the female. At the upper grade point level, that is 3.0 grade point average or better, the percentage of those students entering the college was approximately 13 per cent, with a slightly higher percentage of females than males in the upper category. About twice the percentage of students entering college are from the lower achievement level at high school as compared to the upper achievement level. High school G.P.A.'s calculated on a five point scale.

In the case of the persister and the non-persister samples, the high school grade point average was one of the discriminating factors. That is to say, there was a significant difference in the high school grade point averages of the persister and non-persister sample. This difference was attributed to the middle category of achievement, specifically for those students who had achieved at a 2.0 to 2.4 grade point average. As might be expected, a larger proportion of non-persister

students were in this low "C" grade category. The tendency was, therefore, that the persister had a higher pre-college academic achievement. The females in both samples tended to have received a significant majority of upper grades, with her male counterpart receiving a significant majority of lower level grades.

High School Program

Ability, or lack of it, has sometimes been associated with the particular high school program taken. Traditionally, the more intellectually inclined have been directed into the high school "academic" program. The non-intellectual may have been persuaded by prestige seeking parents into the academic program, even though it may not have been the correct choice. The alternative was the non-academic program, often labeled as "occupational" or "technical." For those forced to accept this alternative, the route to tertiary education at a university level has usually been denied. With the "open door" policy of the community college, the high school graduate from the non-academic program now has an opportunity to at least test his abilities at a college level, although at this point, less than one tenth of the sample investigated were identified as graduates of the "occupational" or "technical" program. It must be concluded that, upon evidence presently available, the students from these programs are no more prone to withdraw from college than are students from the academic programs. It is safe to conclude that more students from high school programs normally not considered as university preparatory should be encouraged to try the offerings of the comprehensive community college.

Eligibility

"If you cannot get into university, try a community college." This statement has implied that the college is a haven for university rejects. This was not true. Somewhat over one third of the random sample studied were eligible to enter the university. This eligibility was determined, not only on program completed at high school, but on the achievement of a minimum 60 per cent average in senior year courses (3.0 grade point average). The proportion of college age students eligible for direct entry to university ranged from five to ten times the proportion of the mature student depending upon sex and the semester of enrollment. The eligibility of the female to enter the university directly ranged from four to ten percentage points higher than for the male.

One might suspect that of those students not eligible for direct university entrance the proportion of non-persister students would be higher. This was not the case. In other words, the student who has taken a non-academic high school program or has not reached the required achievement level, or is short a few credits and the student who has just been unable to meet the university entrance requirements, is not any more prone to withdraw after enrolling at the college than is the student who could have entered university if he so desired. This would certainly indicate that more emphasis should be placed on encouraging students to take a greater variety of subjects at high school and then transfer to a community college for two years prior to possible transfer to a university.

College Grade Point Average

One of the lessons, probably unintentionally learned by students very early in their educational career, is that failure is always ready to reach out and envelop them. As failure appears to be reaching out to the individual, it might be expected that in order to avoid this failure, the student might withdraw from the college. It could, therefore, be suspected that those who were low in their college grades would comprise the greater part of the non-persister sample. College grade point average for the semester prior to withdrawal and the cumulative average for all semesters of attendance were not a significant feature. That is to say, there was no significant difference in the college achievement between the persister or non-persister sample. It must be concluded that actual college achievement will not differentiate between the persister or non-persister student.

There were students in both samples who had average and above average achievement. While there was no apparent difference in achievement as applied to persistence or non-persistence, there were noted definite and significant differences for male and female students. The male carried on a trend started in high school, that is, a greater proportion of males achieved in the lower third of the grade categories than did the female. In fact nearly three times the percentage of male students were listed in the 1.0 to 1.4 average category than females. This was a statistically significant difference, as was the case when student achievement was examined by semester. A greater percentage of spring and summer semester sample subjects achieved in the upper half

of the achievement scale, than was found for the fall semester. The variation, then, of college achievement as represented by grade point average is greater between the sexes, and the semesters, than it is for the persister and non-persister categories.

Although not directly associated with grade point averages, it may be proposed that the academic expectations of the student and the grades achieved would be related. That is to say, the better student would have the more realistic and ambitious goal. The poorer student would probably not be planning on graduate school for his highest academic expectations. Fully one quarter of the sample had expectations of at least a Master's degree or a Doctor's degree. A further third expressed every intention of completing a Bachelor's degree. The remainder would settle for a one year college certificate or a two year college diploma. The non-persister expectations did not differ significantly from the persister. Even when questioned one year after withdrawal, the expectations of the non-persister were not different than expressed by those students who had continued. It might be concluded that withdrawal from college had not dampened the academic enthusiasm of this sample. It would certainly appear that for many of the non-persisters, their present dropout from college was regarded as no more than an interruption in the attainment of their stated academic goal.

Semesters of Enrollment

The transition from high school to college, for some, may be a rather difficult experience. A new philosophy, a new freedom, possibility of higher standards, more pressure, a "bigness," all may combine

to frustrate the new student. As a consequence, it could be expected that the new student would be a prime candidate for withdrawal. Approximately 45 per cent of the persister sample was comprised of students in their first semester of enrollment, while approximately one third of the non-persister sample were new to the college. Although there was no significant difference in the number of semesters of enrollment for each sample, there was a slightly greater percentage of non-persisters from the "two semester" enrollment category than for persisters. A similar situation was noted for the "four semester" category. In each of these cases the difference was less than four percentage points. Once again, not a statistical difference, but enough to indicate that the greater tendency to withdraw from college came after several semesters in attendance.

Number of Courses

The number of courses in which students enrolled was one of the five items where a statistical significant difference between persister and non-persister was noted. Two fifths of the students were enrolled full time at the college, that is, enrolled for an academic load of five courses or more. There was a definite trend on the part of the full time student to persist while the student enrolled part time, especially with a load of just two courses, tended to have a higher attrition rate. This is not to say that full time students did not withdraw from the college. But the number of non-persister sample subjects found in the full time category was significantly lower than the number found for the persister sample. The reason for this significant difference is not

clear, at least from results of the study, but it may be speculated that the part time student, since he only has two or three subjects on which to concentrate finds it easier to avoid his academic obligation and consequently easier to withdraw completely from the direct college influence. It should also be pointed out that it is costing him less to withdraw since his fee expenditure has not been as great as for the full time student.

Type III Data

Type III data is basically the report of student opinions on various matters related to college attendance which were obtained for both persister and non-persister from the follow-up questionnaire.

Persister students in college education might be expected to have a measurably different perspective on certain opinion and interest objects from those held by the non-persister students. The opinions generally examined in the study have centered around: (1) general interest in education, (2) political involvement in educational issues, (3) influence on the decision making patterns of the student, (4) reading, radio, television, and movie going habits, (5) assessment of college, and (6) reasons for withdrawal and the planned activity to be carried on after withdrawal.

Three opinion items distinguished between the persister student and the non-persister student. A greater proportion of non-persisters than persisters were quite definite that, if starting post secondary education again, they would not enroll in a community college. The non-persister was not as certain as the persister that he had made the best

decision to attend college. Furthermore, there was a significant difference in the reporting by the non-persister of his major activity for the twelve month period after withdrawal and the probable activity as reported by the persister in case of future withdrawal. The observed frequency of the non-persister who worked on a part time basis, less than four hours per day, was somewhat higher than the observed frequency from the persister sample.

In the remaining opinion items there were no significant differences in responses.

General Interest in Education

The level of interest in education expressed by the student during his teen-age years and while at college apparently had little, if any, influence on persistence or non-persistence. Although less than 1 per cent of either the persister or non-persister sample expressed "no interest" in education during their stay at college, some 6 to 8 per cent expressed no interest during their high school age years. While one third of the respondents reported an interest in education which increased during their late teen years, 45 per cent of the non-persister respondents indicated an interest which increased while at college.

"Work experience" or experiences associated with work appeared most influential in any reported change of interest, both in the late teens, and especially while at college. Second to this in influence was listed as "teacher." Yet here as elsewhere there was not a statistical difference in the influencing factors between those who persisted and those that did not.

Neither did the interest in school or college of friends of the respondent show any significant difference between the persister and non-persister. It might be assumed that close associates would influence one another. Over one half of both persisters and non-persisters reported that their college friends were interested in college. Yet it was rather interesting to note that approximately 40 per cent of the respondents felt that their college friends were not interested in college.

Over one third of the students reported that educational issues mattered a great deal to them even before they came to college, however, the college environment apparently stimulated this interest since approximately one half of the respondents pointed out that educational issues mattered a great deal during their enrollment at college. Just under one half of the respondents, both before and during college, reported that educational issues mattered somewhat. In all of these cases there was no statistical difference in the response of persister or non-persister.

Political Involvement in Educational Interests

Involvement in political activity was not a distinguishing variable between persister and non-persister students. One third of the respondents believed they had felt strongly enough to participate in political activity, yet, on the other hand, only about one quarter of those so indicating actually did become involved. Forty-five per cent of the respondents indicated the intention to work actively with a political party if an election was under way and there was an important educational issue. As in previous comments, however, there was once

again no reported significant difference in the intention of the persister or non-persister sample.

Decision Making Patterns

As has been previously pointed out, contrary to popular opinion, students from lower income families, from families whose breadwinner was employed in one of the lower socio-economic occupations, did not exhibit any greater tendency toward attrition than students from the upper level occupations. The possibility was examined that the outlook of others toward the student's own opinions might be an influencing factor in his persistence. For example, would the persister tend to be a person of more independence, a person who had assumed more responsibility than an individual who was a non-persister. In overall percentages, a higher percentage of non-persister students indicated a dissatisfaction with the consideration given them in important family decision making, especially in those of personal importance. Approximately one quarter of the non-persister students responded in this manner, some 5 per cent more than the persister student. Conversely, a greater percentage of persister sample subjects indicated satisfaction when compared with the non-persister. However, when tested statistically, no significant difference was observed between the groups.

Similarly there was little variation in the proportion of responses from each sample as to the probability of the individual being asked for his own opinion or advice on educational matters. No significant difference between the persister or non-persister sample was

observed in the frequency of responses indicating that the student was "more likely" to be asked his opinions. About 40 per cent felt they would be asked. On this point, however, some one quarter of the respondents were unsure as to whether they would be asked or not. The persister student was just as unsure as the non-persister student. Any hesitancy about being asked for their opinions, at least while at college, did not appear to be caused by a lack of college friends, as approximately one half of both persister and non-persister sample subjects reported they had as many friends at college as desired. The non-persister apparently had a slightly more difficult task in making friends at college when compared with the persister subjects. Somewhat over one third of the non-persister sample reported few or no college friends, although they responded that they could have more if they wished. Just under one third of the persister sample indicated this response. The frequency of responses was, however, not significantly different for either the persister or non-persister sample. Students from the summer session did report a considerably greater problem in making friends than did students from the other two semesters. In fact, just over one quarter of the non-persister respondents from the summer session reported having as many friends as desired. For the other semesters, the indication was that about one half of the respondents were satisfied they had as many friends as desired. It would seem that the friendliness of a large institution would have a direct bearing on the decision making patterns of a student, at least as far as his decision to withdraw was concerned. The lack of friends, as reported by summer semester

respondents may in some way be linked with the higher rate of attrition observed for this semester.

The questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate the relative importance of certain items as far as their own decision making was concerned. The items given in order of frequency were: "family," "health," "education," "politics," "work," "religion," "country," and "community." There was no statistical difference in the frequency of responses from either the persister or non-persister, that is, each group reported the "family" as the most important consideration given in the making of decisions.

Reading Habits

Surprisingly enough, there were no observed differences in the reading habits of the persister and non-persister sample, at least as far as newspapers and magazines which were read regularly. The local evening paper was reportedly read by over two thirds of the respondents. A greater percentage of the non-persister sample (5 per cent), when compared to the persister sample (2 per cent) read the Financial Post. One fifth of the students, both persisters and non-persisters, read no newspaper regularly. The newspaper reading habits did not differ between the sexes nor did they differ for students according to the semester in which they enrolled.

The persisters and non-persisters also had similar reading habits when it came to magazines, with approximately 40 per cent reading Time and about 16 per cent reading Life. Ten per cent reported reading "other" than the magazines listed in the structured questionnaire, and

where the "other" publication was mentioned, for the most part, it was identified as one of the numerous "underground" publications.

Radio, Television, and Movie Going Habits

It has been mentioned by some observers that television, radio, and movies, lure the individual away from other more active and worthwhile pursuits. If this was the case, it might be expected that the non-persisters would report a greater time either prior to admission to college or during his enrollment at college either watching television, listening to the radio, or attending the movies.

While attending college, the average student reported listening to the radio approximately one hour per day on weekdays, and viewing television for an equal length of time, although it was noted that about one third of the students reported radio listening and television viewing on a weekday as long as two hours for each. On weekends, the radio listening time remained fairly constant, but television time rose to an average of four hours on Saturday and an equal amount on Sunday. The times in these cases, however, did not differ significantly for the persister or non-persister sample.

During the period that students were not enrolled at college, the time spent listening to the radio was not different from time spent while at college. In the case of television viewing, however, college attendance for both persister and non-persister seems to have reduced the students' viewing time. The average television viewing time on a weekday prior to college enrollment was reported at two hours per day, twice the length of time reported while at college. The apparent change

in habits was, however, little different for the persister and non-persister sample subjects.

Movie attendance was not any more popular for non-persister than for persister. Approximately 37 per cent reported attendance for the screening of a film at one to five times a year. Approximately one quarter attended the movies one to three times a month, and approximately another one quarter about once every two months.

Assessment of College

Eighty-five per cent of the non-persisters reported at the time of their withdrawal that they were satisfied with instructors. One year later a change in response had occurred whereas only 81 per cent of the non-persisters still felt satisfaction with instruction. This change was not statistically significant. Similarly, at the time of withdrawal, approximately 85 per cent reported they were satisfied with course offerings. One year later, a significant change in response was recorded with no more than 60 per cent reporting satisfaction with course offerings. At the time of withdrawal, 90 per cent reported satisfaction with college counseling services. One year later, just over one half reported satisfaction. The reasons for such significant changes in response to satisfaction with course offerings and counseling are speculative at this time. Possibly there was a certain fear of giving an honest response at the time of withdrawal especially since the procedure is handled by the counseling service. Possibly, when the student had time to reflect over the period of a year his evaluation had changed. One interesting point was noted. As determined by responses to the

questionnaire, the assessment by persisters and non-persisters of college instructors, course offerings, and counseling services showed no significant difference.

Both non-persisters and persisters felt much the same way about the chances of obtaining as good an education in the community college as in the first two years of a university. The majority of students felt that the community college either, "definitely would," or "probably would," provide an education as good as a university. Less than 10 per cent reported it "definitely would not." In a comparison of college and university counseling services about one third of those who had had experience with both, indicated college counseling services as being inferior to the university. Once again, there was no significant difference in this variation between the persister and non-persister.

There was, however, a definite difference between the samples in the attitude of the non-persister as far as re-enrollment in college. There was a greater tendency on the part of the non-persisters to indicate that if they were starting post-secondary education over again they would not enroll in a community college. Even though 10 per cent of non-persisters as compared with 3 per cent of persisters reported they would not enroll in a college if they were starting post-secondary education over again, some 57 per cent of non-persisters said they "probably would," or "definitely would." A further one third said they "possibly would." Some inconsistency was evident when these results were analyzed together with the results in answer to the respondents' decision to attend college. In this latter case approximately 16 per

cent of the non-persisters responding to this question indicated that they "should have gone elsewhere." This was somewhat higher than the 10 per cent that reported they would not re-enroll at the community college if they had it to do over again. Although there was a statistical difference in the responses of persisters and non-persisters, the variation was only in response to whether the decision was "definitely the best." Even here, nearly one third of the dropouts felt that their decision to attend college had definitely been the best decision. Just under one half of the persisters believed they had made the best decision. Another one third of each group were "fairly" sure as to their attendance at college being the best decision.

It would, therefore, seem that the majority of community college students, some two thirds to three quarters, depending on whether they came from the non-persister or persister sample, were satisfied with their college experience. For those that were not, dissatisfaction with counseling and course offerings appeared as the greatest single point of dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction with instructors was also reported as a factor but for no more than 10 to 15 per cent. Instructor dissatisfaction may be attributed to the fact that there is not as yet a requirement that all instructors be professionally prepared for college teaching. Mechanics, social workers, police officers, historians, secretaries, political scientists, and others, have been brought into the college, shown a class of students and, in effect been told to "go ahead now and teach." It would seem rather surprising that dissatisfaction under these circumstances was as low as it was.

However, it must be remembered that in most of the foregoing cases that little if any significant difference existed between those that were non-persisters and those that were persisters. In other words, although dissatisfaction was expressed it did not seem to be a significant factor in causing a student to withdraw.

Influence on Educational Decision Making

The students were asked whom they consulted regarding attendance at college. They were, of course, responding to a structured questionnaire in which a variety of sources were provided for them to check. They could indicate more than one source. The sources given, either alone or in combination, in order of frequency were: "college Student Services," "parent or guardian," "high school counselors," "high school teachers," "college instructors," and the "Canada Manpower counselor." The college Student Services was reported by the largest single group as the most important source of help. Neither persisters nor non-persisters showed any significant difference in their responses in this case.

Reason for Withdrawal

The reasons for withdrawal as listed at the time of withdrawal, in order of reporting were: "lack of finances," "prefer to work," "lack of interest," "health reasons," "academic difficulties," "travel," "inappropriate courses," "moving out of town," "family opposition," and several miscellaneous reasons. Those reasons that could be classified as college related, that is, "lack of interest," "academic difficulties," and "inappropriate courses," accounted for one quarter of the attrition

rate. When asked one year after withdrawal to indicate the reason for withdrawal, the questionnaire respondents replied with one exception in much the same manner as they had at the time of withdrawal. Some changes, of course, were noted in the frequency of response to the five main reasons originally listed on the withdrawal card, but the significant change was recorded for the response, "lack of interest." It was not possible to determine whether this response change was an actual re-evaluation of the reason over the twelve month period, or whether the original reason at the time of leaving college was not the true one.

Interestingly enough, the persister respondents, in indicating possible reasons for withdrawal in the future, expressed the same proportion of reasons as had the non-persister.

Activity after Withdrawal

For some students the withdrawal from college was not really a dropout, but rather an interruption in study. One third of the non-persister students re-enrolled at the college within a twelve month period of their initial withdrawal.

The success rate after returning to college was, however, not overly impressive, with approximately three fifths completing their semester of re-enrollment successfully. In fact, one fifth of those who returned once again withdrew from college before the end of the semester.

The reported intention to return to college study after the initial withdrawal was not a reliable forecast, especially for the first twelve month period, and does little to reduce the extent of attrition. Although some 30 per cent of the withdrawal students indicated an

intention to return to the college, only 12 per cent actually did return. In fact the greatest change between planned activity and actual activity on the part of the non-persister was in the decision to return to college. A significant number of students who had reported their intention to return to the college did not do so.

The largest single group of students planned to work immediately upon leaving college. Some 45 per cent had indicated this reason. Yet, when questioned one year later, nearly one third of those who had originally planned to work reported that they did not. A few re-entered the college, a few entered another educational institution, a few travelled, and some apparently just did nothing.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

If there was evidence to indicate a difference between those students who remained enrolled at college and those that withdrew, it was not determined in the study. Of the sixty-nine items investigated from the various sources, a significant difference between persisters and non-persisters was calculated in only five.

If, as some studies imply, social class differences with their economic inequalities are important in influencing an individual's continuation at college, it should be possible to find evidence that financial hardship had a direct bearing on college withdrawal. Yet, if the occupations of family, or for that matter, students, are indicative of socio-economic status, then one must question the bearing that "financial difficulties" have as a reason for withdrawal especially when there was no reported difference in socio-economic status as measured in the study for those that had withdrawn and those that had not withdrawn.

Although there was a slight difference in the high school grade point average between the persister and non-persister, especially in the 2.0 to 2.4 range, achievement as measured by a grade point average, both in the pre-college and college, would apparently not account for the

persistence of some students and not for others. The only educational item (Type II data) that might have some value in discriminating between persisters and non-persisters was the number of courses in which the student enrolled. For example, there was a greater tendency for part time college students to withdraw than full time students.

When it came to the matter of various opinions expressed in response to the questionnaire the only significant difference between the two samples occurred when a greater proportion of non-persister sample subjects than persister sample subjects felt they had made a wrong choice in attending the college.

In the items investigated, the difference in frequency of response for the persister and non-persister was not as pronounced as was the difference in the frequency of response between the sexes, or in the frequency of response between the three semesters.

It must therefore be concluded, that all types of students withdraw from the community college, and that the non-persister was not characterized by any significant measurable differences from the persister.

The very phrase "the problem of college dropouts" seems to imply that any individual who fails to accept his opportunity to complete college is somehow misguided or inadequate. Yet, as has been shown in the study, students drop out for many reasons; some return to study, some find satisfaction elsewhere, while others apparently will reject tertiary education in any form. For these reasons, further detailed study of the non-persister student is recommended. Not only should those students who withdraw from college during the semester be studied,

but those students who withdraw from individual courses, as well as those who do not re-enroll in a further semester and complete their diploma, certificate or transfer requirements, should be studied for both short term as well as long term effects.

Institutional Recommendations

Although it was evident from the findings of the study that the majority of students from the sample were interested in their studies and satisfied with the college, there was a sizable minority that not only displayed sufficient lack of interest to apparently cause them to withdraw, but also reported dissatisfaction with instructors, counseling services, and course offerings.

It would, therefore, be quite natural to recommend improvement in instruction, counseling, and course offerings. Since, however, the reasons for the lack of interest and dissatisfaction are not known, at least for the current student sample, a definitive recommendation can not be given. It must, however, be assumed that since the primary object of the comprehensive community college is to teach, this objective is not being entirely met. In other words, the expectations of the students are not being met, at least in some cases. This was not only evident for the non-persister, but for the persister student as well. Just why these factors should influence one group more than another is still unclear.

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following six specific recommendations are given.

1) Community college instructors should be trained and educated for their teaching position. The very function of the college suggests that the instructors are employed as "teachers"--not as social workers, historians, nurses, mathematicians, policemen, or geographers. A breadth of knowledge, background, and skill are required to effectively translate the abstract and symbolic into the practical and realistic. It may be, that persons with these backgrounds are being placed on faculty in the comprehensive college without the opportunity to seek out the knowledge and skill to teach effectively. It is entirely possible that some specialized preparation for instructors in such areas as history of the community college, philosophy of the community college, and techniques and methods of instruction, might assist the instructor in the reduction of the withdrawal rate, especially amongst those students indicating they were not satisfied with instruction.

2) Financial problems were related as the largest single reason for attrition. College authorities, together with the assistance of the Federal government should set up an "emergency fund" for students with financial difficulties. This fund could be created by eliminating scholarships and using the resources for those in financial need.

3) In view of the evidence collated in the study, the "open door" policy should be continued as it does not seem to produce an inordinate rate of withdrawals, and does, as has been shown, provide an educational opportunity for many who qualify for no other institution.

4) The comparatively high rate of withdrawal of students during the summer semester should be examined somewhat more closely. Perhaps the role of the summer semester might be re-evaluated as a result of such examination. A different approach to the summer offerings should be considered as the behavior of students during this semester appeared to be atypical when compared to the other two semesters. Serious consideration might be given to the elimination of this semester completely.

5) In view of the apparent influence of financial difficulties in the decision to withdraw, and the high incidence of persister students who reported that if they had to withdraw in the future it would be for financial reasons, a strong recommendation is made for the provision of an expanded "work-study" program. With the present climate of concern for the national state of unemployment, the time is appropriate for college administrators to approach all levels of government for direct financial support for "part work-part study" programs to be administered by the individual college. Such a program would provide the opportunity for both part time employment and part time study by college students in lieu of placing them upon an already overburdened labor market.

6) There seems to be a discrepancy between a rather low percentage of non-persister students who admit to academic difficulties and a rather high percentage who actually do have such a problem. It may be speculated that more students than anticipated are reluctant to admit to academic difficulties. In view of this, the college might provide more opportunity for study skill and coaching "drop-in" centers where students may go without undue formality to receive academic help before they drop out.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

Barger, Ben, and Everette Hall. "The Interaction of Ability Levels and Socioeconomic Variables in the Prediction of College Dropouts and Grade Achievement," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXV (Summer, 1965), 501-8.

Bayer, Alan E. "The College Drop-out: Factors Affecting Senior College Completion," Sociology of Education, I (Summer, 1968), 305-16.

Bossen, Doris A., and Collins W. Burnett. "What Happens to the Withdrawal Student?" Junior College Journal, XL (June/July, 1970), 30-36.

Boyer, Ernest L., and William B. Michael. "Outcomes of College," Review of Educational Research, XXXV (October, 1965), 277-79.

Bragg, Emma W. "A Study of Student Withdrawal at 'W.U.,'" The Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVII (February, 1956), 199-202.

Burton, Robin, and Philip Johnson. "Identifying Potential Drop-outs with Class Lists," Improvement of College and University Teaching, XVII (Summer, 1969), 178-79.

Carlson, J. S., and K. W. Wagner. "College Dropouts," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (March, 1965), 256-59.

Chambers, J. L., B. Barger, and L. R. Lieberman. "Need Patterns and Abilities of College Dropouts," Educational Psychological Measurements, XXV (Spring, 1965), 509-16.

Chase, Clinton I. "The College Dropout: His High School Prologue," NASSP Bulletin, LIV (January, 1970), 66-71.

Daniel, Kathryn Barchard. "A Study of College Dropouts with Respect to Academic and Personality Variables," The Journal of Educational Research, LX (January, 1967), 230-32.

Demos, George D. "Analysis of College Dropouts--Some Manifest and Covert Reasons," Personal and Guidance Journal, XLVI (March, 1968), 681-84.

Eckland, Bruce K. "A Source of Error in College Attrition Studies," Sociology of Education, XXXVIII (Fall, 1964), 60-72.

Farnsworth, D. S. "Some Non-Academic Causes of Success and Failure in College Students," College Admissions, II (1955), 72-8.

Feder, D. "Factors Which Affect Achievement and its Prediction at the College Level," Journal of American Association of College Registrars, XV (Spring, 1940), 107-117.

Ford, D. H., and H. B. Urban. "College Dropouts: Successes or Failures," Educational Record, XLVI (Spring, 1965), 77-92.

Fullmer, D. W. "Success and Perseverance of University Students," Journal of Higher Education, XXVII (January, 1956), 445-47.

Gekoski, Norman, and Solomon Schwartz. "Student Mortality and Related Factors," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (September, 1961), 192-94.

Grace, H. A. "Personality Factors and College Attrition," Peabody Journal of Education, XXV (July, 1957), 36-40.

Hackman, Richard J., and Wendell S. Dysinger. "Commitment to College as a Factor in Student Attrition," Sociology of Education, XLIII (Summer, 1970), 311-24.

Holmes, Charles H. "Why They Left College," College and University, XXXIV (Spring, 1959), 295-300.

Holmes, Darrell. "An Investigation of Student Attitudes Which May be Related to Leaving College," Journal of Educational Research, LII (September, 1958), 17-21.

Ikenberry, Stanley O. "Factors in College Persistence," Journal of Counseling Psychology, VIII (Winter, 1961), 322-23.

Irvine, D. E. "Graduation and Withdrawal: An Eight-year Follow-Up," College and University, XLI (Fall, 1965), 32-40.

Ivey, A. E., F. E. Peterson, and S. E. Treble. "The Personality Record as Predictor of College Attrition: A Discriminant Analysis," College and University, XLI (Winter, 1966), 199-205.

Johnson, Granville B., Jr. "A Proposed Technique for the Analysis of Drop-outs at a State College," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (January, 1954), 381-87.

Jones, Gordon. "Community Colleges, a Great Starting Place for University Students," The B.C. Teacher, XLVIII (March, 1969), 222-31.

Koelsche, Charles L. "A Study of Student Drop-out Problems at Indiana University," Journal of Educational Research, XLIX (January, 1956), 357-64.

Landrith, Harold F. "Prescription for Junior College Dropouts," School and Society, XCIX (January, 1971), 49-51.

Linns, L. J., and H. Pitt. "The Staying Power and Rate of Progress of University of Wisconsin Freshmen," College and University, XXIX (October, 1953), 86-99.

Marascuilo, Leonard A. "Large-Sample Multiple Comparisons," Psychological Bulletin, LXV (May, 1966), 283-84.

Marks, Edmond. "Student Perceptions of College Persistence and Their Intellective, Personality, and Performance Correlates," The Journal of Educational Psychology, LVIII (August, 1967), 210-21.

Marsh, L. M. "College Dropouts--A Review," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (January, 1966), 475-81.

Mitchell, Fred T. "Why Freshmen Leave College," Journal of Higher Education, XIII (January, 1942), 95-100.

Munger, P. F. "Student Persistence in College," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (December, 1956), 241-43.

Panos, Robert J., and A. W. Astin. "Attrition Among College Students," American Educational Research Journal, V (January, 1968), 57-72.

Reed, Horace B. "College Students' Motivations Related to Voluntary Dropout and Under-Overachievement," Journal of Educational Research, LXI (May-June, 1968), 412-16.

Robin, Burton, and Philip Johnson. "Identifying Potential Drop-outs with Class Lists," Improvement of Colleges and University Teaching, XVII (Summer, 1969), 178-79.

Rose, Harriett A. "Prediction and Prevention of Freshman Attrition," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (Winter, 1965), 399-403.

_____, and Charles F. Elton. "Another Look at the College Dropout," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (Summer, 1967), 11-13.

Savicki, Victor, Harry Schumer, and Robert E. Stanfield. "Student Role Orientations and College Dropouts," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XVII (November, 1970), 311-24.

Schoemer, James R. "The College Pushout," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (March, 1968), 677-80.

Sexton, V. S. "Factors Contributing to Attrition in College Populations: Twenty-five Years of Research," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXII (Fall, 1965), 301-26.

Shuman, R. B. "College Dropouts: An Overview," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (April, 1956), 347-52.

Slater, M. "Perception: A Context for the Consideration of Persistence and Attrition Among College Men," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (March, 1957), 435-40.

Slocum, W. L. "Social Factors Involved in Academic Mortality," College and University, XXXII (Fall, 1956), 53-64.

Smith, Leland. "Significant Differences Between High-Ability Achieving and Nonachieving College Freshmen as Revealed by Interview Data," Journal of Educational Research, XLIX (September, 1965), 10-12.

Snyder, Louise May. "Why Do They Leave?" Journal of Higher Education, XI (January, 1940), 26-32.

Stordahl, Kalmer. "Influences on Voluntary Withdrawal from College," College and University, XLV (Winter, 1970), 163-71.

William, Vernon. "The College Dropout: Qualities of His Environment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (May, 1967), 878-82.

Yoshino, R. "College Dropouts at the End of the Freshman Year," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXII (September, 1958), 42-8.

Books

Baskin, Samuel, ed. Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Campbell, Gordon. Community Colleges in Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada Ltd., 1971.

Cervantes, Lucius F. The Dropout: Cause and Cures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969.

Fletcher, Basil. Universities in the Modern World. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1968.

Gleazer, E. J., Jr. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

Koos, Leonard U. The Community College Student. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1970.

Macdonald, John B. Higher Education in British Columbia and a Plan for the Future. Vancouver, B.C.: The University of British Columbia, 1962.

Medsker, Leland L., and Dale Tillery. Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Owen, D. B. Handbook of Statistical Tables. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1962.

Rockefeller Brother Fund. The Pursuit of Excellence. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958.

Sanford, N., ed. The American College. New York: John Wiley Co., 1962.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956.

Trent, James W., and Leland L. Medsker. Beyond High School. Berkeley: University of California, 1967.

Wilson, Logan, ed. Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

Miscellaneous

Baird, L. L. "Family Income and the Characteristics of College Bound Students," A.C.T. Research Reports. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1967.

British Columbia. The Royal Commission on Education. Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1961.

Bromley, Ann, ed. A Day at Santa Fe. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1971.

Canada. Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tract. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963.

Canada. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Education Division. "Post-Secondary Student Population Survey," The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970.

Canadian Association for Adult Education. Non-Degree Research in Adult Education in Canada 1968. Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1968.

Canadian Association for Adult Education. Non-Degree Research in Adult Education in Canada 1969. Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1969.

Cohen, A. M. The Relationships Among Student Characteristics, Changed Instructional Practices and Student Attrition in Junior College, Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1969.

Craven, C. J. "Why We Withdrew." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1951.

Cross, K. Patricia. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Dennison, John D., and Gordon Jones. A Long Range Study of the Subsequent Performance and Degree Attainment of Students Who Transferred from Vancouver City College to The University of British Columbia from 1966-1969. Vancouver, B.C.: Vancouver City College, 1970.

_____. A Study of the Characteristics of Students Who Withdrew from Vancouver City College During the 1969-1970 Academic Year. Vancouver, B.C.: Vancouver City College, 1971.

_____. A Socio-economic Study of College Students. Vancouver, B.C.: Academic Board for Higher Education in British Columbia, 1971.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Current Documents in Higher Education: A Bibliography. Washington: D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1970.

Iffert, R. E. Retention and Withdrawal of College Students. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.

Knoell, Dorothy M., and Leland L. Medsker. Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students From Two-to Four Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation. Berkeley: University of California, 1964.

Medsker, Leland L., and J. W. Trent. USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 438. Berkeley: University of California, 1965.

Morishima, J. K. Comparative Attrition of Freshmen, 1960-1968. Seattle: University of Washington, 1968.

Nall, A. W. "The Academic Success of Junior College Transfers to the Junior Level at the University of Colorado." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1958.

Pace, C. Robert. Personality Factors on the College Campus. Austin: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962.

Pigott, A. V. Education and Employment, Study No. 9. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1962.

Rice, G. A. "An Examination of the Earned Grade Distribution Between 'Successful' and 'Dropout' Students at Yakima Valley College. Yakima: Yakima Valley College, 1969.

Roueshe, John E., and John R. Boggs. Junior College Institutional Research: State of the Art. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Sprague, H. T., ed. Research on College Students. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and The Center for Higher Education, 1960.

Turner, H. J., Jr. "The Half that Leaves: A Limited Survey of Attrition in Community Junior College." Gainesville: Florida University, 1970.

Weigand, G. "Motivational Factors Associated With Success and Failure of Probational Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1951.

Wise, W. M. They Come for the Best of Reasons--College Students Today. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

APPENDIX A - WITHDRAWAL CARD

WITHDRAWAL SURVEY -- CONFIDENTIAL

1. Main reasons for withdrawal:

a. lack of finances . . .	( )	e. academic difficulties . .	( )
b. prefer to work	( )	f. health reasons	( )
c. lack of interest . . .	( )	g. other (indicate)_____	
d. family opposition . .	( )	_____	

2. In general, were you satisfied with: (circle one)

a. instructors	YES	NO
b. course offerings	YES	NO
c. counseling	YES	NO

3. What are your immediate plans? (check only one)

a. work	( )
b. re-enter VCC next semester	( )
c. enter educational institution other than VCC	( )
d. travel	( )
e. undecided	( )

Student Name _____ Reg # _____
(Surname) (Given)

Sin # _____

Student Address _____ Phone _____

Alternate Address _____

Withdrawal Date _____

a. In person	( )	c. Telephone	( )
b. Third party	( )	d. Mail	( )

Comments:

The withdrawal survey card appearing above has been rearranged to meet the margin requirements of the report form. The survey card used in the study was printed on 8" x 5" McBee punch card, Form KD581B.

APPENDIX B - NON-PERSISTER QUESTIONNAIRE

I should like to take this opportunity to thank you for taking part in this rather important survey and study of community college students. The researchers give you their assurance that you will not be identified with your answers. However, for certain statistical purposes, it has been necessary to stamp the answer sheet with an identification number. The key for this number will be only available to the two researchers at the University of British Columbia.

When completed, please enclose the answer sheet in the stamped return envelope provided and mail directly to the university. As soon as your responses are coded for computer analysis, the answer sheet will be destroyed.

I hope you will give us your candid impression in response to the questionnaire items.

Once again, thank you for your cooperation, and the return of the yellow answer sheet at your earliest convenience.

QUESTIONNAIRE DIRECTIONS

Mark your answers in the correct space on the yellow answer sheet.

Place an X in the space between the brackets ( ) beside the letter corresponding to the correct answer.
Mark only one answer for each question unless instructed otherwise.
Ignore the figures to the right of the brackets ( ) as they are for computer programing only.

The questions are on the left-hand side of the page and the answers are in the boxes to the right of the question as in the examples below. Place the correct column of the yellow answer page along the right-hand side of the questionnaire and mark the appropriate answer on the answer sheet.

Questionnaire		Yellow answer sheet		
	Page 10	Page 10		
70. Is this 1984?	A. Yes B. No C. I don't know	70.	A. ( ) B. (X) C. ( )	70/1 70/2 70/3
71. Do you attend V.C.C.?	A. Yes B. No	71.	A. (X) B. ( )	71/1 71/2

1. When you were about 15 to 18 years of age, how would you describe your level of interest in education and in schooling?

A. No interest in education
B. Interest in education which did not change appreciably
C. An interest in education which increased
D. An interest in education which decreased
E. An interest in education which fluctuated considerably

2. If your interest in education changed (that is, if you answered C, D, or E in the above question) which one of the following was most important in this change?

A. Immediate family and close relatives
B. Out-of-school friends, such as neighbours or general acquaintances
C. Work experience, co-workers
D. Important events which affected me

3. During your stay at college, how would you describe your level of interest in education and in college?

A. No interest in education
B. Interest in education which did not change appreciably
C. An interest in education which increased
D. An interest in education which decreased
E. An interest in education which fluctuated considerably

4. If your interest in education changed while in college (that is, if you answered C, D, or E in question 3) which of the following was most important in this change? Mark one only.

A. Immediate family and close relatives
B. Out of school friends, such as neighbours or general acquaintances
C. Work experience
D. Important events which affected me
E. School teachers
F. School friends
G. Other
H. Cannot recall

5. When you were in elementary school (grade 1 to 8) were many of your school friends interested in school?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Cannot recall

Go on to the next page

6. When you were in high school (grade 9 to 12) were many of your school friends interested in school?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Cannot recall

7. During your stay at college, were many of your college friends interested in college?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Cannot recall

8. How well informed about educational issues in B.C. would you say you were, compared to most students your age during your enrollment at college?

A. Better than average
B. About average
C. Less than average
D. Cannot recall

9. How important were educational matters to you during the period prior to enrollment at college?

A. Mattered a great deal
B. Mattered a bit
C. Didn't matter at all
D. Cannot recall

10. How important were educational matters to you during the period of enrollment in college?

A. Mattered a great deal
B. Mattered a bit
C. Didn't matter at all
D. Cannot recall

11. Have you ever felt strongly enough about an educational issue that you were prepared to participate municipally or provincially in political activities to further that educational issue?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Cannot recall

12. If your answer to question 11 was yes, did you actually become involved in any political activity?

A. Yes
B. No

13. If a political campaign was now under way, either at a municipal or provincial level, and there was an important educational issue at stake, would you if approached work actively for a party or candidate of your choice?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Do not know

Go on to the next page

14. If you can recall how much of a say you had in important family decisions during your adolescent years, especially in those matters you considered important to your own life and activities, just how much of a say in such decisions do you feel you had?

A. A lot
B. Something
C. Nothing
D. Cannot recall
E. No such decision making occasions

15. Generally speaking, were you satisfied or not with the consideration given you in such matters of personal importance?

A. Satisfied
B. Dissatisfied
C. Mixed feelings
D. Cannot recall

16. In your own circle of acquaintances and friends, are you more or less likely to be asked for your opinions and advice on educational matters?

A. More
B. Less
C. Same
D. Do not really know

17. Persons sometimes say that the opinions of others are important when trying to arrive at a decision on an educational issue. Which of the following has been particularly helpful in educational decision making for you. Indicate <u>one</u> only.

A. Close friends
B. Family members
C. Employer or business groups
D. Religious leaders
E. Union members
F. Educational leaders
G. Leaders of political parties

18. Which one of the following statements would apply to you? "As far as close friends are concerned while at Vancouver City College, I...."

A. had as many good friends at college as I wanted.
B. had a number of good friends and I would like to have a few more, but it appears difficult to make friends with the people at college.
C. had few or no good friends at college but I could have had more if I wanted.
D. had few or no good friends at college because the people seemed unfriendly.

Go on to the next page

19. In this complex world it sometimes happens that people must make a choice between things that mean a lot to them. In making a choice you may sometimes come into conflict with others. Listed below are things that sometimes get involved in such conflicts. Please indicate numerically the importance of these items with number 1 being used to indicate the most important and number 8 being used to indicate the least in importance.

A. Health
B. Politics
C. Family
D. Education
E. Country
F. Religion
G. Work
H. Community

20. Which newspapers do you read regularly?

A. Sun
B. Province
C. Columbian
D. Other (specify)
E. None regularly
F. Financial Post

21. What magazines do you read regularly?

A. Chatelaine
B. Life
C. Look
D. Macleans
E. National Geographic
F. Newsweek
G. Playboy
H. Reader's Digest
I. Saturday Night
J. Time
K. T.V. Guide
L. Others (specify)
M. None

22. On the average, how many hours would you spend listening to the radio during the time that you were enrolled at college?

A. on a weekday_____hrs
B. on Saturday_____hrs
C. on Sunday_____hrs

23. On the average, how many hours would you spend watching T.V. during the time that you were enrolled at college?

A. on a weekday_____hrs
B. on Saturday_____hrs
C. on Sunday_____hrs

Go on to the next page

24. On the average, how many hours would you spend listening to the radio during the time you were not enrolled at college?

A. on a weekday_____hrs
B. on a Saturday_____hrs
C. on Sunday_____hrs

25. On the average, how many hours would you spend watching T.V. during the time that you were not enrolled at college?

A. on a weekday_____hrs
B. on a Saturday_____hrs
C. on Sunday_____hrs

26. How often do you go to the movies?

A. One or more times a week
B. Once, twice or three times a month
C. Less than once a month, but at least once every two months
D. One to five times a year
E. Less than once a year
F. Never

27. What kind of business did your father work in and what kind of work did he do there during your pre college years? (If your father worked at different types of jobs, indicate the two or three jobs held for the longest period of time.)

A. Kind of business_____
_____
B. Kind of work_____
_____

28. Was he self-employed or did he work for someone else?

A. Self-employed
B. Employed by someone else

29. What kind of business did your grandfather work in, and what kind of work did he do there?

A. Kind of business_____
_____
B. Kind of work_____
_____
C. Cannot recall

Go on to the next page

30. By and large how would you describe your family's situation in your childhood by the standards of that time?

A. Very badly off, in poverty
B. Below average somewhat, but not at a poverty level
C. Average, normal
D. Better than average, but not well off
E. Very well off
F. Cannot recall

31. What kind of business or industry do you work in, and what kind of work do you do there? (If you are presently not working then indicate this and give the kind of business and kind of work for your last regular occupation.)

A. Not presently working_____

B. Kind of business_____

_____

C. Kind of work_____

_____

32. Are you the chief wage earner for your household?

A. Yes
B. No

33. If you answered "no" to question 32, please indicate the kind of business or industry the Chief Wage Earner works in and the kind of work done there.

A. Kind of business_____

_____

B. Kind of work_____

_____

34. While at Vancouver City College, in general were you satisfied with:

a. instructors

A. Yes
B. No

b. course offerings

A. Yes
B. No

c. counseling

A. Yes
B. No

35. If you were starting post-secondary education again would you enroll in a community college such as V.C.C.?

A. Definitely would
B. Probably would
C. Possibly would
D. Definitely would not

Go on to the next page

36. Do you feel that you can obtain as good an education in a community college as you could by attending a university for the first two years?

A. Definitely would
B. Probably would
C. Possibly would
D. Definitely would not

37. If you have been to a university or have applied for admittance to a university, how would you compare the guidance and counseling services with those of Vancouver City College?

A. Community college definitely better
B. Community college somewhat better
C. About equal
D. Community college somewhat poorer
E. Community college much poorer

38. What is the highest academic attainment you expect to reach?

A. One year college certificate
B. Two year college Certificate
C. Bachelor's degree
D. Master's degree
E. Doctor's degree
F. None of the above

39. College students sometimes consult other people before deciding to enroll at college. Whom did you consult about choosing V.C.C.? (Mark as many as may apply)

A. Parents or guardians
B. High School teacher(s)
C. High School counselor(s)
D. V.C.C. Student Services counselor(s)
E. College instructor(s)
F. Canada Manpower counselor

40. Which <u>one</u> of those selected in the preceding question was most helpful in making your choice? (Mark only one.)

A. Parents or guardians
B. High School teacher(s)
C. High School counselor(s)
D. V.C.C. Student Services counselor(s)
E. College instructor(s)
F. Canada Manpower counselor
G. None of the above

41. When you withdrew from study at Vancouver City College, which <u>one</u> of the following would be considered as the main reason?

A. Lack of finances
B. Prefer to work
C. Lack of interest
D. Family opposition
E. Academic difficulties
F. Health reasons
G. Other (indicate)

Go on to the next page

42. During the first thirty days after withdrawing from V.C.C. which one of the following did you do?

A. Go to work full time (average of at least 36 hours per week)
B. Go to work part time (less than 4 hours a day)
C. Work part time (but more than 4 hours a day)
D. Work on weekends only
E. Unable to find a job
F. Entered an educational institution other than V.C.C.
G. Travelled
H. Other (indicate)

43. During the past year, since withdrawing from V.C.C., which one of the following would you say was your major activity for most of the 12 month period?

A. Go to work full time (average of at least 36 hours per week)
B. Go to work part time (less than 4 hours a day)
C. Work part time (but more than 4 hours a day)
D. Work on weekends only
E. Unable to find a job
F. Entered an educational institution other than V.C.C.
G. Travelled
H. Other (indicate)

44. Looking back, do you think that you made the best decision by choosing to attend V.C.C.?

A. I definitely made the best decision
B. I'm pretty sure I made the best decision
C. I'm not sure whether I made the best decision
D. I'm pretty sure I should have gone elsewhere
E. I definitely should have gone elsewhere

APPENDIX C - PERSISTER QUESTIONNAIRE

41. If you should decide to withdraw from study at Vancouver City College, which one of the following would be considered as the main reason?

A. Lack of finances
B. Prefer to work
C. Lack of interest
D. Family opposition
E. Academic difficulties
F. Health reasons
G. Other (indicate)

42. If you ever withdraw from V.C.C. during a semester, which one of the following would you probably do during the first thirty days after withdrawing?

A. Go to work full time (average of at least 36 hours per week)
B. Go to work part time (less than 4 hours a day)
C. Work part time (but more than 4 hours a day)
D. Work on weekends only
E. Unable to find a job
F. Enter an educational institution other than V.C.C.
G. Travel
H. Other (indicate)

43. If you ever withdraw from V.C.C. which one of the following would probably be your major activity for most of the 12 month period after withdrawal?

A. Go to work full time (average of at least 36 hours per week)
B. Go to work part time (less than 4 hours a day)
C. Work part time (but more than 4 hours a day)
D. Work on weekends only
E. Unable to find a job
F. Enter an educational institution other than V.C.C.
G. Travel
H. Other (indicate)

The questionnaire was identical in wording to the Non-Persister questionnaire except for questions 41, 42, and 43.
The reworded questions for the Persister questionnaire appear above.

Vancouver City College, Langara. 100 West 49th Ave., Vancouver 15, B.C. Tel. (604) 324-5511

VCC

APPENDIX D - PRELIMINARY LETTER

You are one of an important group of students being asked to cooperate in a research project concerning students who have, at one time or another, attended Vancouver City College.

We wish to improve on the many kinds of opportunities for college students, both in college and after leaving college. For this task it is necessary to know something about your environment, interests, opinions and future outlook.

With this in mind, this project has been initiated, which we hope will lead us to some answers that may assist students in the future. One aspect of this study will be a request that you assist us by answering a fairly detailed questionnaire. Since this is a questionnaire rather than a test, there will be no "right" or "wrong" answers.

Within the next month, the questionnaire and answer form will be mailed to you. In order to ensure that your replies are not associated with you personally, your answer sheet will be identified by a special code number, and may be mailed directly to The University of British Columbia.

We hope that you will find the time required to answer the questionnaire and to return it at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

G. Jones

GJ:kj

Vancouver City College, Langara. 100 West 49th Ave., Vancouver 15, B.C. Tel. (604) 324-5511

VCC

APPENDIX E - FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Several weeks ago a college survey questionnaire was sent to you. We have had an exceptionally good return of replies to this questionnaire.

We would like to hear from you as soon as possible. In case you have misplaced the first questionnaire and answer sheet, a second copy along with a stamped return envelope is included.

If you were hesitant about responding to the first questionnaire because of the identification number, we have left it off this answer sheet. Instead your number is at the bottom of this letter. If you like you may write it in the provided space on the yellow answer sheet, or leave it off, just as you wish.

Regardless of whether you identify your responses or not, we would like to hear from you, as your opinions will help us to formulate a clearer picture of community college students.

Yours truly,

G. Jones

GJ:kj

APPENDIX F - QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER SHEET

Page 1

1. A. ( ) 1/1
   B. ( ) 1/2
   C. ( ) 1/3
   D. ( ) 1/4
   E. ( ) 1/5

2. A. ( ) 2/1
   B. ( ) 2/2
   C. ( ) 2/3
   D. ( ) 2/4

3. A. ( ) 3/1
   B. ( ) 3/2
   C. ( ) 3/3
   D. ( ) 3/4
   E. ( ) 3/5

4. A. ( ) 4/1
   B. ( ) 4/2
   C. ( ) 4/3
   D. ( ) 4/4
   E. ( ) 4/5
   F. ( ) 4/6
   G. ( ) 4/7
   H. ( ) 4/8

5. A. ( ) 5/1
   B. ( ) 5/2
   C. ( ) 5/3

Go to Page 2

Page 2

6. A. ( ) 6/1
   B. ( ) 6/2
   C. ( ) 6/3

7. A. ( ) 7/1
   B. ( ) 7/2
   C. ( ) 7/3

8. A. ( ) 8/1
   B. ( ) 8/2
   C. ( ) 8/3
   D. ( ) 8/4

9. A. ( ) 9/1
   B. ( ) 9/2
   C. ( ) 9/3
   D. ( ) 9/4

10. A. ( ) 10/1
    B. ( ) 10/2
    C. ( ) 10/3
    D. ( ) 10/4

11. A. ( ) 11/1
    B. ( ) 11/2
    C. ( ) 11/3

12. A. ( ) 12/1
    B. ( ) 12/2

13. A. ( ) 13/1
    B. ( ) 13/2
    C. ( ) 13/3

Go to Page 3

Page 3

14. A. ( ) 14/1
    B. ( ) 14/2
    C. ( ) 14/3
    D. ( ) 14/4
    E. ( ) 14/5

15. A. ( ) 15/1
    B. ( ) 15/2
    C. ( ) 15/3
    D. ( ) 15/4

16. A. ( ) 16/1
    B. ( ) 16/2
    C. ( ) 16/3
    D. ( ) 16/4

17. A. ( ) 17/1
    B. ( ) 17/2
    C. ( ) 17/3
    D. ( ) 17/4
    E. ( ) 17/5
    F. ( ) 17/6
    G. ( ) 17/7

18. A. ( ) 18/1
    B. ( ) 18/2
    C. ( ) 18/3
    D. ( ) 18/4

Go to Page 4

Page 4

19. A. ( ) 19/1
    B. ( ) 20/1
    C. ( ) 21/1
    D. ( ) 22/1
    E. ( ) 23/1
    F. ( ) 24/1
    G. ( ) 25/1
    H. ( ) 26/1

20. A. ( ) 27/1
    B. ( ) 27/2
    C. ( ) 27/3
    D. ( ) 27/4
    E. ( ) 27/5
    F. ( ) 27/6

21. A. ( ) 28/1
    B. ( ) 28/2
    C. ( ) 28/3
    D. ( ) 28/4
    E. ( ) 28/5
    F. ( ) 28/6
    G. ( ) 28/7
    H. ( ) 28/8
    I. ( ) 28/9
    J. ( ) 29/1
    K. ( ) 29/2
    L. ( ) 29/3
    M. ( ) 29/4

22. A.____hrs 30/
    B.____hrs 31/
    C.____hrs 32/

23. A.____hrs 33/
    B.____hrs 34/
    C.____hrs 35/

Turn over for Page 5

This number will be your identification. Absolute secrecy of individual returns will be maintained.

Page 5

24. A.____hrs 36/

B.____hrs 37/

C.____hrs 38/

25. A.____hrs 39/

B.____hrs 40/

C.____hrs 41/

26. A. ( ) 42/1
B. ( ) 42/2

C. ( ) 42/3

D. ( ) 42/4
E. ( ) 42/5
F. ( ) 42/6

27. A._____43/

_____

B._____44/

_____

28. A. ( ) 45/1
B. ( ) 45/2

29. A._____46/

_____

B._____47/

_____

C. ( ) 48/1

Go to Page 6

Page 6

30. A. ( ) 49/1
B. ( ) 49/2

C. ( ) 49/3
D. ( ) 49/4

E. ( ) 49/5
F. ( ) 49/6

31. A. ( ) 50/1

B._____51/

_____

C._____52/

_____

32. A. ( ) 53/1
B. ( ) 53/2

33. A._____54/

_____

B._____55/

_____

34.
a. A. ( ) 56/1
B. ( ) 56/2

b. A. ( ) 57/1
B. ( ) 57/2

c. A. ( ) 58/1
B. ( ) 58/2

35. A. ( ) 59/1
B. ( ) 59/2
C. ( ) 59/3
D. ( ) 59/4

Go to Page 7

Page 7

36. A. ( ) 60/1
B. ( ) 60/2
C. ( ) 60/3
D. ( ) 60/4
E. ( ) 60/5

37. A. ( ) 61/1

B. ( ) 61/2

C. ( ) 61/3
D. ( ) 61/4

E. ( ) 61/5

38. A. ( ) 62/1

B. ( ) 62/2

C. ( ) 62/3
D. ( ) 62/4
E. ( ) 62/5
F. ( ) 62/6

39. A. ( ) 63/1
B. ( ) 64/1
C. ( ) 65/1
D. ( ) 66/1

E. ( ) 67/1
F. ( ) 68/1

40. A. ( ) 69/1
B. ( ) 69/2
C. ( ) 69/3
D. ( ) 69/4

E. ( ) 69/5
F. ( ) 69/6
G. ( ) 69/7

41. A. ( ) 70/1
B. ( ) 70/2
C. ( ) 70/3
D. ( ) 70/4
E. ( ) 70/5
F. ( ) 70/6
G. ( ) 70/7

Go to Page 8

Page 8

42. A. ( ) 71/1

B. ( ) 71/2

C. ( ) 71/3

D. ( ) 71/4
E. ( ) 71/5
F. ( ) 71/6

G. ( ) 71/7
H. ( ) 71/8

43. A. ( ) 72/1

B. ( ) 72/2

C. ( ) 72/3

D. ( ) 72/4
E. ( ) 72/5
F. ( ) 72/6

G. ( ) 72/7
H. ( ) 72/8

44. A. ( ) 73/1

B. ( ) 73/2

C. ( ) 73/3

D. ( ) 73/4

E. ( ) 73/5

Thank you!

Please mail in enclosed envelope to U. B. C.